

AN INVARIANT FORMULATION OF SPECIAL RELATIVITY, OR THE "TRUE TRANSFORMATION RELATIVITY," AND ITS COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENTS

Tomislav Ivezić

Ruder Bošković Institute, P.O.B. 180, 10002 Zagreb, Croatia
ivezic@rudjer.irb.hr

February 2, 2008

Different formulations of special relativity are theoretically discussed. First an invariant formulation, i.e., the "true transformations (TT) relativity," is exposed. There a physical quantity is represented by a true tensor which comprises both components and a basis. Also the usual covariant formulation and the "apparent transformations (AT) relativity" are considered. It is shown that all the experiments are in agreement with the "TT relativity" but not always with the "AT relativity."

PACS number(s): 03.30.+p

Key words: true transformations relativity, comparison with experiments

1 INTRODUCTION

In the recent papers [1] and [2] an invariant formulation of special relativity (SR) is proposed and it is called the "true transformations (TT) relativity." Furthermore the differences between this formulation, the usual covariant approach to SR and the traditionally used "apparent transformations (AT) relativity" (a typical example of the "AT relativity" is Einstein's [3] formulation of SR) are also examined in [1] and [2]. Some parts of these formulations are discussed in [4], [5] as well. The notions of the TT and the AT are first introduced by Rohrlich [6], and, in the same meaning, but not under that name, discussed in [7] too. In [1, 2] (and [4, 5]) we have also presented the theoretical discussion of the TT of the spacetime length for a moving rod and a moving clock, and of the AT for the same examples, i.e., the AT of the spatial distance, the Lorentz "contraction," and the AT of the temporal distance, the time "dilatation." In this paper we expose the main theoretical results from [1, 2, 4, 5] and compare them with some experimental results.

It is usually interpreted that the experiments on "length contraction" and "time dilatation" test SR, but the theoretical discussion from [1, 2] shows that such an interpretation of the experiments refers exclusively to the "AT relativity," and not to the "TT relativity."

It has to be noted that in the experiments in the "TT relativity," in the same way as in the theory, see [1, 2], the measurements in different inertial frames of reference (IFRs) (and different coordinatizations) have to refer to the same four-dimensional (4D) tensor quantity. In the chosen IFR and the chosen coordinatization the measurement of some 4D quantity has to contain the measurements of all parts of such a quantity. However in almost all experiments that refer to SR only the quantities belonging to the "AT relativity" were measured. From the "TT relativity" viewpoint such measurements are incomplete, since only some parts of a 4D quantity, not all, are measured. This fact presents a serious difficulty in the reliable comparison of the existing experiments with the "TT relativity," and, actually, we shall be able to compare in a quantitative manner only some of the existing experiments with the "TT relativity."

To examine the differences between the nonrelativistic theory, the commonly used "AT relativity," and the "TT relativity" we shall make the comparison of these theories with some experiments in the following sections.

First in Sec. 2 we briefly expose the main theoretical results from [1, 2] about the "TT relativity" and its theoretical comparison with the "AT relativity" and with the usual covariant approach. In Sec. 4 we discuss the "muon" experiment in the nonrelativistic approach, in the "AT relativity" and in the "TT relativity." Since the Michelson-Morley experiment is discussed in detail in [2] we expose in Secs. 5 and 5.1 only the main results from [2] in order to use them for the consideration of the modern laser versions in Sec. 5.2 and for the discussion of the Kennedy-Thorndike type experiments in Sec. 6. In Secs. 7, 7.1 and 7.2 we consider different Ives-Stillwell type experiments both in the "AT relativity," Sec. 7.1, and in the "TT relativity," Sec. 7.2. Finally in Sec. 8 the discussion and conclusions are presented.

2 A BRIEF THEORETICAL DISCUSSION OF THE THREE APPROACHES TO SR

Rohrlich [6], and also Gamba [7], emphasized the role of the concept of sameness of a physical quantity for different observers. The principal difference between the "TT relativity" and the "AT relativity" stems from the difference in that concept of sameness of a physical system, i.e., of a physical quantity, for different observers. This concept of *sameness* of a physical quantity for different observers actually determines the difference in what is to be understood as a relativistic theory. Our invariant approach to SR, i.e., the "TT relativity," and the concept of sameness of a physical quantity for different observers in that approach, differs not only from the "AT relativity" approach but also from the usual covariant approach (including [6] and [7]).

In the "TT relativity" SR is understood as the theory of a 4D spacetime with pseudo-Euclidean geometry. All physical quantities (in the case when no basis has been introduced) are described by true tensor fields, that are defined on the 4D spacetime, and that satisfy true tensor equations representing physical laws. When the coordinate system has been introduced the physical quantities are mathematically represented by the coordinate-based geometric quantities (CBGQs) that satisfy

the coordinate-based geometric equations. The CBGQs contain both the components and the basis one-forms and vectors of the chosen IFR. Speaking in mathematical language a tensor of type (k,l) is defined as a linear function of k one-forms and l vectors (in old names, k covariant vectors and l contravariant vectors) into the real numbers, see, e.g., [8, 9, 10]. If a coordinate system is chosen in some IFR then, in general, any tensor quantity can be reconstructed from its components and from the basis vectors and basis 1-forms of that frame, i.e., it can be written in a coordinate-based geometric language, see, e.g., [10]. The symmetry transformations for the metric g_{ab} , i.e., the isometries [8], do not change g_{ab} ; if we denote an isometry as Φ^* then $(\Phi^*g)_{ab} = g_{ab}$. Thus an isometry leaves the pseudo-Euclidean geometry of 4D spacetime of SR unchanged. At the same time they do not change the true tensor quantities, or equivalently the CBGQs, in physical equations. Thus *isometries are* what Rohrlich [6] calls *the TT*. In the "TT relativity" different coordinatizations of an IFR are allowed and they are all equivalent in the description of physical phenomena. Particularly two very different coordinatizations, the Einstein ("e") [3] and "radio" ("r") [11] coordinatization are discussed in [1, 2] and [5] and will be exploited in this paper as well. (In the "e" coordinatization the Einstein synchronization [3] of distant clocks and cartesian space coordinates x^i are used in the chosen IFR. The main features of the "r" coordinatization will be given below. For the recent discussion of the conventionality of synchronization see [12] and references therein.) The *CBGQs* representing some 4D physical quantity in different relatively moving IFRs, or in different coordinatizations of the chosen IFR, *are all mathematically equal* since they are connected by the TT (i.e., the isometries). Thus they are really the same quantity for different observers, or in different coordinatizations. Hence *in the "TT relativity" the same quantity for different observers is either the true tensor quantity or the CBGQ*. Therefore it is appropriate to call the "TT relativity" approach (which deals with the true tensors or with the CBGQs) as an invariant approach in contrast to the usual covariant approach (which deals with the components of tensors taken in the "e" coordinatization). We suppose that in the "TT relativity" such *4D tensor quantities are well-defined not only mathematically but also experimentally, as measurable quantities with real physical meaning. The complete and well-defined measurement from the "TT relativity" viewpoint is such measurement in which all parts of some 4D quantity are measured.*

In the usual covariant approach one does not deal with the true tensors, or equivalently with CBGQs, but with *the basis components of tensors* (mainly in the "e" coordinatization) and with the equations of physics written out in the component form. Mathematically speaking the concept of a tensor in the usual covariant approach is defined entirely in terms of the transformation properties of its components relative to some coordinate system. Hence *in the usual covariant approach the same quantity for different observers is the component form of a true tensor, or equivalently of a CBGQ, in some specific coordinatization*. The definitions of the same quantity in [6] and [7] also refer to such component form in the "e" coordinatization of tensor quantities and tensor equations. Although it is true that the components of some tensor refer to the same tensor quantity considered in two relatively moving IFRs S and S' and in the "e" coordinatization, but they are not the same 4D quantity since the bases are not included. This will be explicitly shown below.

The third approach to SR uses the AT of some quantities. In contrast to the TT (i.e., the isometries) the AT are not the transformations of spacetime tensors and they do not refer to the same 4D quantity. *The AT refer exclusively to the component form of tensor quantities and in that form they transform only some components of the whole tensor quantity*. In fact, depending on the used AT, only a part of a 4D tensor quantity is transformed by the AT. Such a part of a 4D quantity, when considered in different IFRs (or in different coordinatizations of some IFR) corresponds to different quantities in 4D spacetime. Some examples of the AT are: the AT of the synchronously defined spatial length [3], i.e., the Lorentz contraction, and the AT of the temporal distance, i.e., the conventional dilatation of time that is introduced in [3] and considered in [1, 2]. Any formulation of SR which uses the AT we call the "AT relativity." An example of such formulation is Einstein's formulation of SR which is based on his two postulates and which deals with all the mentioned AT. Thus *in the "AT relativity" the same quantity for different observers is considered to be a part of a 4D tensor quantity which is transformed by the AT*.

In this paper I use the same convention with regard to indices as in [1, 2]. Repeated indices imply summation. Latin indices $a, b, c, d, \dots$ are to be read according to the abstract index notation, see [8], Sec.2.4.; they "...should be viewed as reminders of the number and type of variables the tensor acts on, *not* as basis components." They designate geometric objects in 4D spacetime. Thus,

e.g., l_{AB}^a (a distance 4-vector $l_{AB}^a = x_B^a - x_A^a$ between two events A and B with the position 4-vectors x_A^a and x_B^a) and $x_{A,B}^a$ are (1,0) tensors and they are defined independently of any coordinate system. Greek indices run from 0 to 3, while latin indices $i, j, k, l, \dots$ run from 1 to 3, and they both designate the components of some geometric object in some coordinate system, e.g., $x^\mu(x^0, x^i)$ and $x^{\mu'}(x^{0'}, x^{i'})$ are two coordinate representations of the position 4-vector x^a in two different inertial coordinate systems S and S' . Similarly the metric tensor g_{ab} denotes a tensor of type (0,2) (whose Riemann curvature tensor R_{bcd}^a is everywhere vanishing; the spacetime of special relativity is a flat spacetime, and this definition includes not only the IFRs but also the accelerated frames of reference). This geometric object g_{ab} is represented in the component form in an IFR S , and in the "e" coordinatization, i.e., in the $\{e_\mu\}$ basis, by the 4×4 diagonal matrix of components of g_{ab} , $g_{\mu\nu,e} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$, and this is usually called the Minkowski metric tensor. Note that the subscript 'e' stands for the Einstein coordinatization.

In the following we shall also need the expression for the covariant 4D Lorentz transformations L^a_b , which is independent of the chosen synchronization, i.e., coordinatization of reference frames (see [13], [1, 2] and [5]). It is

$$L^a_b \equiv L^a_b(v) = g^a_b - \frac{2u^a v_b}{c^2} + \frac{(u^a + v^a)(u_b + v_b)}{c^2(1 + \gamma)}, \quad (1)$$

where u^a is the proper velocity 4-vector of a frame S with respect to itself, $u^a = cn^a$, n^a is the unit 4-vector along the x^0 axis of the frame S , and v^a is the proper velocity 4-vector of S' relative to S . Further $u \cdot v = u^a v_a$ and $\gamma = -u \cdot v/c^2$. When we use the Einstein coordinatization then L^a_b is represented by $L^\mu_{\nu,e}$, the usual expression for pure Lorentz transformation which connects two coordinate representations, basis components (in the "e" coordinatization), $x_e^\mu, x_e^{\mu'}$ of a given event. $x_e^\mu, x_e^{\mu'}$ refer to two relatively moving IFRs (with the Minkowski metric tensors) S and S' ,

$$\begin{aligned} x_e^{\mu'} &= L^{\mu'}_{\nu,e} x_e^\nu, & L^{0'}_{0,e} &= \gamma_e, & L^{0'}_{i,e} &= L^{i'}_{0,e} = -\gamma_e v_e^i/c, \\ L^{i'}_{j,e} &= \delta_j^i + (\gamma_e - 1)v_e^i v_{je}/v_e^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $v_e^\mu \equiv dx_e^\mu/d\tau = (\gamma_e c, \gamma_e v_e^i)$, $d\tau \equiv dt_e/\gamma_e$ and $\gamma_e \equiv (1 - v_e^2/c^2)^{1/2}$. Since $g_{\mu\nu,e}$ is a diagonal matrix the space x_e^i and time t_e ($x_e^0 \equiv ct_e$) parts of x_e^μ do have their usual meaning.

The geometry of the spacetime is generally defined by the metric tensor g_{ab} , which can be expanded in a coordinate basis in terms of its components as $g_{ab} = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu$, and where $dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu$ is an outer product of the basis 1-forms.

The connection between the basis vectors in the "r" and "e" coordinatizations is given as

$$r_0 = e_0, \quad r_i = e_0 + e_i, \quad (3)$$

see [11], [5] and [1, 2]. The metric tensor g_{ab} becomes $g_{ab} = g_{\mu\nu,r} dx_r^\mu \otimes dx_r^\nu$ in the coordinate-based geometric language and in the "r" coordinatization, where the basis components of the metric tensor are

$$g_{00,r} = g_{0i,r} = g_{i0,r} = g_{ij,r} (i \neq j) = -1, \quad g_{ii,r} = 0. \quad (4)$$

dx_r^μ, dx_r^ν are the basis 1-forms in the "r" coordinatization and in S , and $dx_r^\mu \otimes dx_r^\nu$ is an outer product of the basis 1-forms, i.e., it is the basis for (0,2) tensors.

The transformation matrix $T^\mu_{\nu,r}$ which transforms the tensor quantities from the "e" coordinatization to the "r" coordinatization is given as

$$T^\mu_{\mu,r} = -T^0_{i,r} = 1, \quad (5)$$

and all other elements of $T^\mu_{\nu,r}$ are = 0. Using this $T^\mu_{\nu,r}$ we find

$$x_r^\mu = T^\mu_{\nu,r} x_e^\nu, \quad x_r^0 = x_e^0 - x_e^1 - x_e^2 - x_e^3, \quad x_r^i = x_e^i. \quad (6)$$

For the sake of completeness we also quote the Lorentz transformation $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,r}$ in the "r" coordinatization. It can be easily found from L^a_b (1) and the known $g_{\mu\nu,r}$, and the elements that are different from zero are

$$\begin{aligned} x_r^{\mu'} &= L^{\mu'}_{\nu,r} x_r^\nu, & L^{0'}_{0,r} &= K, & L^{0'}_{2,r} &= L^{0'}_{3,r} = K - 1, \\ L^{1'}_{0,r} &= L^{1'}_{2,r} = L^{1'}_{3,r} = (-\beta_r/K), & L^{1'}_{1,r} &= 1/K, & L^{2'}_{2,r} &= L^{3'}_{3,r} = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $K = (1 + 2\beta_r)^{1/2}$, and $\beta_r = dx_r^1/dx_r^0$ is the velocity of the frame S' as measured by the frame S , $\beta_r = \beta_e/(1 - \beta_e)$ and it ranges as $-1/2 < \beta_r < \infty$.

An example of isometry is the covariant 4D Lorentz transformation L^a_b (1). When the coordinate basis is introduced then, for example, the isometry L^a_b (1) will be expressed as the coordinate Lorentz transformation $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,e}$ (2) in the "e" coordinatization, or as $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,r}$ (7) in the "r" coordinatization.

Now we can better explain the above mentioned difference between three approaches to SR in the understanding of the concept of the same quantity for different observers. We shall consider some simple examples in the "TT relativity": the spacetime length for a moving rod and then for a moving clock. The same examples will be also examined in the "AT relativity."

2.1 The spacetime length for a moving rod and a moving clock

Let us take, for simplicity, to work in 2D spacetime. Then we consider a true tensor quantity, a distance 4-vector (the (1,0) tensor) $l^a_{AB} = x^a_B - x^a_A$ between two events A and B (with the position 4-vectors x^a_A and x^a_B). l^a_{AB} is chosen to be a particular 4-vector which, in the usual "3+1" picture, corresponds to an object, a rod, that is at rest in an IFR S and situated along the common $x^1_e, x^{1'}_e$ - axes. (The same example is already considered in [1, 2] and [5].) This true tensor can be represented in the coordinate-based geometric language in different bases, $\{e_\mu\}$ and $\{r_\mu\}$ in an IFR S , and $\{e_{\mu'}\}$ and $\{r_{\mu'}\}$ in a relatively moving IFR S' , as $l^a_{AB} = l^\mu_e e_\mu = l^\mu_r r_\mu = l^{\mu'}_e e_{\mu'} = l^{\mu'}_r r_{\mu'}$, where, e.g., e_μ are the basis 4-vectors, $e_0 = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ and so on, and l^μ_e are the basis components when the "e" coordinatization is chosen in some IFR S . The decompositions $l^\mu_e e_\mu$ and $l^\mu_r r_\mu$ (in an IFR S , and in the "e" and "r" coordinatizations respectively) and $l^{\mu'}_e e_{\mu'}$ and $l^{\mu'}_r r_{\mu'}$ (in a relatively moving IFR S' , and in the "e" and "r" coordinatizations respectively) of the true tensor l^a_{AB} are all mathematically *equal* quantities. Thus they are really the same quantity considered in different relatively moving IFRs and in different coordinatizations. (The expressions for l^μ_r and $l^{\mu'}_r$ can be easily found from the known transformation matrix $T^\mu_{\nu,r}$.) Particularly for this choice of the geometric quantity l^a_{AB} its decomposition in the "e" coordinatization and in S is $l^a_{AB} = l^0_e e_0 + l^1_e e_1 = 0e_0 + L_0 e_1$, while in S' , where the rod is moving, it becomes $l^a_{AB} = -\beta_e \gamma_e L_0 e_{0'} + \gamma_e L_0 e_{1'}$, and, as explained above, it holds that

$$l^a_{AB} = 0e_0 + L_0 e_1 = -\beta_e \gamma_e L_0 e_{0'} + \gamma_e L_0 e_{1'}. \quad (8)$$

We see from (8) that in the "e" coordinatization there is a dilatation of the spatial part $l^1_e = \gamma_e L_0$ with respect to $l^1_e = L_0$. However it is clear from the above discussion that comparison of only spatial parts of the components of the distance 4-vector l^a_{AB} in S and S' is physically meaningless in the "TT relativity." When only some components of the whole tensor quantity are taken alone then they do not represent some definite physical quantity in the 4D spacetime. Similarly the decompositions of l^a_{AB} in the "r" coordinatization are

$$l^a_{AB} = -L_0 r_0 + L_0 r_1 = -KL_0 r_{0'} + (1 + \beta_r)(1/K)L_0 r_{1'}, \quad (9)$$

where $K = (1 + 2\beta_r)^{1/2}$. In the "TT relativity" the geometric quantity l^a_{AB} , i.e., the coordinate-based geometric quantities $l^\mu_e e_\mu = l^{\mu'}_e e_{\mu'} = l^\mu_r r_\mu = l^{\mu'}_r r_{\mu'}$, comprising both, components and the basis, is the same 4D quantity for different observers. Note that if $l^0_e = 0$ then $l^{\mu'}_e$ in any other IFR S' will contain the time component $l^{0'}_e \neq 0$. The spacetime length l between two points (events) in 4D spacetime is defined as

$$l = (g_{ab} l^a l^b)^{1/2}. \quad (10)$$

This spacetime length (10) is frame and coordinatization independent quantity, i.e., it holds that $l = (l^\mu_{e,r} l_{\mu,e,r})^{1/2} = (l^\mu_{e,r} l_{\mu',e,r})^{1/2} = L_0$. In the "e" coordinatization the geometrical quantity l^2 can be written in terms of its representation l^2_e , with the separated spatial and temporal parts, $l^2 = l^2_e = (l^i_e l_{ie}) - (l^0_e)^2$. Such separation remains valid in other inertial coordinate systems with the Minkowski metric tensor, and in S' one finds $l^2 = l'^2_e = (l^i_e l_{i'e}) - (l^0_e)^2$, where $l^{\mu'}_e$ in S' is connected with l^μ_e in S by the Lorentz transformation $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,e}$ (2). Further in the "e" coordinatization and in S , the rest frame of the rod, where the temporal part of l^μ_e is $l^0_e = 0$, the spacetime length l is a measure of the spatial distance, i.e., of the rest spatial length of the rod, as in the prerelativistic

physics. Since $g_{\mu\nu,r}$, in contrast to $g_{\mu\nu,e}$, is not a diagonal matrix, then in l_r^2 (the representation of l^2 in the "r" coordinatization) the spatial and temporal parts are not separated.

In a similar manner we can choose another particular choice for the distance 4-vector l_{AB}^a , which will correspond to the well-known "muon experiment," and which is interpreted in the "AT relativity" in terms of the time "dilatation". (This example is also investigated in [1, 2].) First we consider this example in the "TT relativity." The distance 4-vector l_{AB}^a will be examined in two relatively moving IFRs S and S' , i.e., in the $\{e_\mu\}$ and $\{e_{\mu'}\}$ bases. The S frame is chosen to be the rest frame of the muon. Two events are considered; the event A represents the creation of the muon and the event B represents its decay after the lifetime τ_0 in S . The position 4-vectors of the events A and B in S are taken to be on the world line of a standard clock that is at rest in the origin of S . The distance 4-vector $l_{AB}^a = x_B^a - x_A^a$ that connects the events A and B is directed along the e_0 basis vector from the event A toward the event B . This geometric quantity can be written in the coordinate-based geometric language. Thus it can be decomposed in the bases $\{e_\mu\}$ and $\{e_{\mu'}\}$ as

$$l_{AB}^a = c\tau_0 e_0 + 0e_1 = \gamma c\tau_0 e'_0 - \beta\gamma c\tau_0 e'_1. \quad (11)$$

and similarly in the "r" coordinatization as

$$l_{AB}^a = c\tau_0 r_0 + 0r_1 = Kc\tau_0 r'_0 - \beta_r K^{-1} c\tau_0 r'_1. \quad (12)$$

We again see that these decompositions, containing both the basis components and the basis vectors, are the same geometric quantity l_{AB}^a . l_{AB}^a does have only temporal parts in S , while in the $\{e_{\mu'}\}$ basis l_{AB}^a contains not only the temporal part but also the spatial part. The spacetime length l is always a well-defined quantity in the "TT relativity" and for this example it is $l = (l_e^\mu l_{\mu e})^{1/2} = (l_{e'}^{\mu'} l_{\mu' e})^{1/2} = (l_r^\mu l_{\mu r})^{1/2} = (l_{r'}^{\mu'} l_{\mu' r})^{1/2} = (-c^2\tau_0^2)^{1/2}$. Since in S the spatial parts $l_{e,r}^\mu$ of $l_{e,r}^\mu$ are zero the spacetime length l in S is a measure of the temporal distance, as in the prerelativistic physics; one defines that $c^2\tau_0^2 = -l_e^\mu l_{\mu e} = -l_r^\mu l_{\mu r}$.

These examples provide a nice possibility to discover the difference in the concept of the same quantity for different observers between the "TT relativity" and the usual covariant approach to SR. The usual covariant approach does not consider the true tensor quantity, e.g., the distance 4-vector l_{AB}^a (or equivalently the CBGQ $l_e^\mu e_\mu$, etc.), but only the basis components, l_e^μ and $l_{e'}^{\mu'}$, in the "e" coordinatization. The *basis components (e.g., l_e^μ and $l_{e'}^{\mu'}$) are considered to be the same quantity for different observers from the point of view of the usual covariant approach to SR.* However, in contrast to the above equalities for the CBGQs, the sets of components, l_e^μ and $l_{e'}^{\mu'}$, taken alone, are not equal, $l_e^\mu \neq l_{e'}^{\mu'}$, and thus they are not the same quantity from the "TT relativity" viewpoint. From the mathematical point of view the components of, e.g., a (1,0) tensor are its values (real numbers) when the basis one-form, for example, e^α , is its argument (see, e.g., [9]). Thus, for example, $l_{AB}^a(e^\alpha) = l_e^\mu e_\mu(e^\alpha) = l_e^\alpha$ (where e^α is the basis one-form in an IFR S and in the "e" coordinatization), while $l_{AB}^a(e^{\alpha'}) = l_{e'}^{\mu'} e_{\mu'}(e^{\alpha'}) = l_{e'}^{\alpha'}$ (where $e^{\alpha'}$ is the basis one-form in S' and in the "e" coordinatization). Obviously l_e^α and $l_{e'}^{\alpha'}$ are not the same real numbers since the basis one-forms e^α and $e^{\alpha'}$ are different bases. It is true that the components of some tensor *refer* to the same tensor quantity considered in two relatively moving IFRs S and S' and in the "e" coordinatization, but *they are not equal* since the bases are not included.

2.2 The "AT relativity" and the AT of special and temporal distances

As already said the AT refer exclusively to the component form of tensor quantities and in that form they transform only *some components* of the whole tensor quantity. Such a part of a 4D quantity, when considered in different IFRs (or in different coordinatizations of some IFR), corresponds to different quantities in 4D spacetime. The usual, i.e., Einstein's formulation of SR is based on two postulates: the principle of relativity and the postulate that the coordinate, one-way, speed of light is isotropic and constant. In that formulation the AT of the synchronously defined *spatial length* [3] and the AT of the *temporal distance* [3] are considered as the main "relativistic" consequences of the postulates. Namely the Lorentz transformations are derived from the two mentioned postulates and then the Lorentz contraction and the dilatation of time are interpreted as that they are the Lorentz transformations of spatial and temporal distances. However the Lorentz transformations are the TT, as can be seen from the preceding sections; they always transform the whole 4D tensor

quantity and thus they refer to the same quantity in 4D spacetime, see, e.g., the relations (8) and (11), or (9) and (12). Since the Lorentz transformations are the TT, i.e., the isometries, they also do not change the pseudo-Euclidean geometry of the spacetime. On the other hand, as will be shown below, the Lorentz contraction and the dilatation of time are typical examples of the AT. The Einstein formulation of SR uses the AT, e.g., the Lorentz contraction and the dilatation of time, as important ingredients of the theory (and also in experimental testing of the theory). Any formulation of SR, which uses some of the AT, we call the "AT relativity."

In order to better explain the difference between the TT and the AT we now consider the same two examples as above but from the point of view of the conventional, i.e., Einstein's [3] interpretations of *the spatial length* of the moving rod and *the temporal distance* for the moving clock. These examples are already considered in [1, 2] and [5] and here we only quote the main results and the definitions.

The synchronous definition of *the spatial length*, introduced by Einstein [3], defines length as *the spatial distance* between two spatial points on the (moving) object measured by simultaneity in the rest frame of the observer. The concept of sameness of a physical quantity is quite different in the "AT relativity" but in the "TT relativity." Indeed, in the usual "AT relativity" one takes only some basis components of the whole 4D tensor quantity l_{AB}^a (that is, of the CBGQs $l_e^\mu e_\mu$ and $l_e^{\mu'} e_{\mu'}$) in S and S' , then performs some additional manipulations with them, and considers that the constructed quantities represent the same physical quantity for observers in two relatively moving IFRs S and S' . Thus for the Einstein's definition of *the spatial length* one considers only *the component* $l_e^1 = L_0$ of $l_e^\mu e_\mu$ (when l_e^0 is taken = 0, i.e., the spatial ends of the rod at rest in S are taken simultaneously at $t = 0$) and compares it with the quantity which is obtained in the following way; first one performs the Lorentz transformation $L^\mu_{\nu',e}$ of the basis components $l_e^{\mu'}$ (but not of the basis itself) from S' to S , which yields

$$\begin{aligned} l_e^0 &= \gamma_e l_e^{0'} + \gamma_e \beta_e l_e^{1'} \\ l_e^1 &= \gamma_e l_e^{1'} + \gamma_e \beta_e l_e^{0'}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Then one retains only the transformation of the spatial component l_e^1 (the second equation in (13)) *neglecting completely the transformation of the temporal part* l_e^0 (the first equation in (13)). Furthermore in the transformation for l_e^1 one takes that the temporal part in S' $l_e^{0'} = 0$, (i.e., the spatial ends of the rod moving in S' are taken simultaneously at some *arbitrary* $t' = b$). The quantity obtained in such a way will be denoted as $L_e^{1'}$ (it is not equal to $l_e^{1'}$ appearing in the transformation equations (13)) This quantity $L_e^{1'}$ defines in the "AT relativity" *the synchronously determined spatial length* of the moving rod in S' . The mentioned procedure gives $l_e^1 = \gamma_e L_e^{1'}$, that is, the famous formula for the Lorentz contraction,

$$L_e^{1'} = l_e^1 / \gamma_e = L_0 / \gamma_e, \quad (14)$$

This quantity, $L_e^{1'} = L_0 / \gamma_e$, is the usual Lorentz contracted *spatial length*, and the quantities L_0 and $L_e^{1'}$ are considered in the "AT relativity" to be the same quantity for observers in S and S' . The comparison with the relation (8) clearly shows that constructed quantities L_0 and $L_e^{1'}$ are *two different and independent quantities in 4D spacetime*. Namely, these quantities are obtained by the same measurements in S and S' ; the spatial ends of the rod are measured simultaneously at some $t_e = a$ in S and also at some $t'_e = b$ in S' ; a in S and b in S' are not related by the Lorentz transformation $L^\mu_{\nu',e}$ or any other coordinate transformation. Thus, *in the "TT relativity" the same quantity for different observers is the tensor quantity, the 4-vector* $l_{AB}^a = l_e^\mu e_\mu = l_e^{\mu'} e_{\mu'} = l_r^\mu r_\mu = l_r^{\mu'} r_{\mu'}$; *only one quantity in 4D spacetime*. However *in the "AT relativity" different quantities in 4D spacetime, the spatial distances* l_e^1 , $L_e^{1'}$ (or in the "r" coordinatization l_r^1 , $L_r^{1'}$) *are considered as the same quantity for different observers*. The relation for the Lorentz "contraction" of the moving rod in the "r" coordinatization can be easily obtained performing the same procedure as in the "e" coordinatization, and it is

$$L_r^{1'} = L_0 / K = (1 + 2\beta_r)^{-1/2} L_0, \quad (15)$$

see also [1, 2] and [5]. We see from (15) that there is a length dilatation $\infty \succ L_r^{1'} \succ L_0$ for $-1/2 \prec \beta_r \prec 0$ and the standard length "contraction" $L_0 \succ L_r^1 \succ 0$ for positive β_r , which clearly shows that the "Lorentz contraction" is not physically correctly defined transformation. *Thus the*

Lorentz contraction is the transformation that connects different quantities (in 4D spacetime) in S and S' , or in different coordinatizations, which implies that it is - an AT.

The same example of the "muon decay" will be now considered in the "AT relativity" (see also [1, 2]). In the "e" coordinatization the events A and B are again on the world line of a muon that is at rest in S . We shall see once again that the concept of sameness of a physical quantity is quite different in the "AT relativity." Thus for this example one compares *the basis component* $l_e^0 = c\tau_0$ of $l_e^\mu e_\mu$ with the quantity, which is obtained from *the basis component* $l_e^{0'}$ in the following manner; first one performs the Lorentz transformation of the basis components l_e^μ (but not of the basis itself) from the muon rest frame S to the frame S' in which the muon is moving. This procedure yields

$$\begin{aligned} l_e^{0'} &= \gamma_e l_e^0 - \gamma_e \beta_e l_e^1 \\ l_e^{1'} &= \gamma_e l_e^1 - \gamma_e \beta_e l_e^0. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Similarly as in the Lorentz contraction *one now forgets the transformation of the spatial part* $l_e^{1'}$ (the second equation in (16)) and considers only the transformation of the temporal part $l_e^{0'}$ (the first equation in (16)). This is, of course, an incorrect step from the "TT relativity" viewpoint. Then taking that $l_e^1 = 0$ (i.e., that $x_{Be}^1 = x_{Ae}^1$) in the equation for $l_e^{0'}$ (the first equation in (16)) one finds the new quantity which will be denoted as $L_e^{0'}$ (it is not the same as $l_e^{0'}$ appearing in the transformation equations (16)). The temporal distance l_e^0 defines in the "AT relativity," and in the "e" coordinatization, the muon lifetime at rest, while $L_e^{0'}$ is considered in the "AT relativity," and in the "e" coordinatization, to define the lifetime of the moving muon in S' . The relation connecting $L_e^{0'}$ with l_e^0 , which is obtained by the above procedure, is then the well-known relation for the time "dilatation,"

$$L_e^{0'}/c = t_e' = \gamma_e l_e^0/c = \tau_0(1 - \beta_e^2)^{-1/2}. \quad (17)$$

By the same procedure we can find (see also [1, 2]) the relation for the time "dilatation" in the "r" coordinatization

$$L_r^{0'} = K l_r^0 = (1 + 2\beta_r)^{1/2} c\tau_0. \quad (18)$$

This relation shows that the new quantity $L_r^{0'}$, which defines in the "AT relativity" the temporal separation in S' , where the clock is moving, is smaller - "time contraction" - than the temporal separation $l_r^0 = c\tau_0$ in S , where the clock is at rest, for $-1/2 < \beta_r < 0$, and it is larger - "time dilatation" - for $0 < \beta_r < \infty$. From this consideration we conclude that *in the "TT relativity" the same quantity for different observers is the tensor quantity, the 4-vector $l_{AB}^\alpha = l_e^\mu e_\mu = l_r^\mu e_\mu = l_r^\mu r_\mu$; only one quantity in 4D spacetime.* However in the "AT relativity" different quantities in 4D spacetime, the temporal distances l_e^0 , $L_e^{0'}$, l_r^0 , $L_r^{0'}$ are considered as the same quantity for different observers. This shows that the time "dilatation" is the transformation connecting different quantities (in 4D spacetime) in S and S' , or in different coordinatizations, which implies that it is - an AT.

The consideration performed in the preceding sections and in this section reveals that the basic elements of the "TT relativity," as an "invariant" formulation of SR, and of the usual Einstein formulation of SR, as an "AT relativity" formulation, are quite different. Einstein's formulation is based on two postulates: (i) the principle of relativity and (ii) the postulate that the coordinate, one-way, speed of light is isotropic and constant. In the "TT relativity" the primary importance is attributed to the geometry of the spacetime; it is supposed that the geometry of our 4D spacetime is a pseudo-Euclidean geometry. The physical quantities are represented by geometric quantities, either by true tensors (when no basis is chosen) or equivalently (when the coordinate basis is introduced) by the CBGQs. Thence in the "TT relativity" there is no need to postulate the principle of relativity as a fundamental law. It is replaced by the requirement that the physical laws must be expressed as true tensor equations or equivalently as the coordinate-based geometric equations in the 4D spacetime. Since the "TT relativity" deals on the same footing with all possible coordinatizations of a chosen reference frame then the second Einstein postulate (ii) also does not hold, in general, in the "TT relativity." Namely, as we have remarked earlier, only in Einstein's coordinatization the coordinate, one-way, speed of light is isotropic and constant, while in, e.g., the "r" coordinatization, it is not the case.

In numerous textbooks and papers the Lorentz contraction and the dilatation of time are considered as very important "relativistic effects." In the discussions about these effects it is always understood that the coordinate Lorentz transformation $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,e}$ (2) in the "e" coordinatization transforms the rest length L_0 to the Lorentz contracted length $L_e^{1'}$, i.e., the formula for the Lorentz contraction (14) is interpreted as the Lorentz transformation of the synchronously determined rest length L_0 . Similarly happens with the formula for the time dilatation (17), which is interpreted as the Lorentz transformation of the proper time interval τ_0 (both events happen at the same spatial point) to the time interval $L_e^{0'}/c$ in the moving frame in which these events happen at different spatial points. Our consideration about the spacetime length and the AT of spatial and temporal distances reveals that *the Lorentz contraction and the dilatation of time are the AT and have nothing to do with the Lorentz transformation as the TT*. Thus *the Lorentz contraction and the dilatation of time* are certainly not true relativistic transformations, or to be more precise, they *have nothing in common with SR*. They surely are not important relativistic effects. Already in 1967. Gamba [7] clearly stated for the Lorentz contraction: "Although it is completely useless concept in physics, it will probably continue to remain in the books as an historical relic for the fascination of the layman." From our consideration follows that the same can be said for the dilatation of time. However, what is really surprising, after more than thirty years from Rohrlich's paper [6] and Gamba's paper [7] the Lorentz contraction and the dilatation of time are still intensively investigated theoretically and experimentally as *relativistic effects* in numerous scientific papers and books. It is generally believed that the apparatus for high-energy experiments in particle physics are already designed in such a way that they take into account longer decay time (the dilatation of time) for moving particle. In the leading physical journals, e.g., in Physical Review C under the heading - Relativistic Nuclear Collisions, one can permanently encounter theoretical and experimental articles in which the Lorentz contraction is understood as an essential part of the relativistic theory. Thus, for example, it is generally accepted in ultra-relativistic nuclear collisions, see, e.g., [14]: "that in the center-of-mass frame two *highly Lorentz contracted nuclei* (my emphasis) pass through each other" Also it is taken in ultrarelativistic heavy-ion reactions that, e.g., [15]: "While the longitudinal extension of the *valence quarks* in a fast-moving nucleon *does indeed look Lorentz contracted* (my emphasis) to a stationary observer in the usual way... ." This issue of ultra-relativistic nuclear collisions will be discussed in more detail elsewhere.

2.3 The discussion of some other definitions of the spatial length

Next we consider two other definitions of the *spatial length*. The first one is an "asynchronous" definition, see, e.g., [17] and [18] and the references therein. (Actually one can speak about the asynchronous formulation of SR.) According to the asynchronous description the spatial length of a moving body is defined as the spatial distance between two points on it, as measured by simultaneity in the rest frame of the body. Namely in the asynchronous formulation of SR the distance 4-vector $l_{AB}^a = x_B^a - x_A^a$ between two events A and B (with the position 4-vectors x_A^a and x_B^a) is written only in the component form and in the "e" coordinatization. In S , the rest frame of the body, it is (in 2D spacetime) $l_{AB}^\mu = (0, L_0)$ (L_0 is the rest length and it is determined synchronously in S). In S' , where the body is moving, the component form in the "e" coordinatization of l_{AB}^a is $l_{AB}^{\mu'} = (-\beta_e \gamma_e L_0, \gamma_e L_0)$. Now comes the main point in the asynchronous definition. It is interpreted in the asynchronous formulation of SR that the spatial part $l_{AB}^{1'} = \gamma_e L_0 = L'$ of $l_{AB}^{\mu'}$ is the "asynchronous" *length* L' , determined asynchronously (since the temporal part is $\neq 0$), in the frame S' in which the body is moving. One can say that there is a Lorentz lengthening in the asynchronous formulation, instead of the usual Lorentz contraction that exists in the "synchronous," i.e., the Einstein formulation of SR. It is considered in the asynchronous formulation that L' in S' and L_0 in S refer to the same quantity. The common feature for both formulations is that *the spatial length of a moving body is assumed to be a well defined physical quantity in 4D spacetime*. Our formulation with true tensors (or the CBGQs) reveals that this is not true; a well defined physical quantity in 4D spacetime that is connected with a moving body can be only a 4D tensor quantity, e.g., either the spacetime length l (10), or the distance 4-vector $l_{AB}^a = x_B^a - x_A^a$. If, for example, one does not use the "e" coordinatization but the "r" coordinatization, then both formulations (synchronous and asynchronous), which deal with the spatial length as a well defined

physical quantity, become meaningless. It is clear from the discussion in Secs. 2 and 2.1 that comparison of only spatial (or temporal) parts of the components of the distance 4-vector l_{AB}^a in S and S' is physically meaningless in the "TT relativity," since *some components of a 4D tensor quantity, when they are taken alone, do not actually represent any 4D physical quantity*. Also we remark that the whole tensor quantity l_{AB}^a comprising components and the basis is transformed by the Lorentz transformation from S to S' . This discussion shows that the asynchronous formulation of SR also belongs to the "AT relativity."

The next definition which will be examined is the relativistic (or radar) length [19]. (One can speak about the radar formulation of SR.) It is assumed in [19] that the relativistic length (the length of a fast-moving rod) is defined as (the third article in [19]): "the half-sum of distances covered by a light signal in direct and opposite directions along the rod." In the 4D spacetime Strel'tsov defines the 4-vector of relativistic length l_{rel}^μ (actually this length is not the 4-vector but it is the component form in the "e" coordinatization of a 4-vector) as: "the half-difference of two light 4-vectors (i.e., the component form) l_d^μ and l_b^μ which describe the corresponding processes of light propagation (in the direct and opposite directions)." Then, in S , the rest frame of the rod, $l_d^\mu = (cL_0/c, L_0, 0, 0)$ and $l_b^\mu = (cL_0/c, -L_0, 0, 0)$, while in S' , where the rod is moving, they are $l_d^{\mu'} = (c\gamma L_0(1+\beta)/c, \gamma L_0(1+\beta), 0, 0)$, and $l_b^{\mu'} = (c\gamma L_0(1-\beta)/c, -\gamma L_0(1-\beta), 0, 0)$. Thence in S one finds $l_{rel}^\mu = (l_d^\mu - l_b^\mu)/2 = (0, L_0, 0, 0)$ and in S' the component form of this 4-vector of relativistic length is $l_{rel}^{\mu'} = (\gamma\beta L_0, \gamma L_0, 0, 0)$. Now Strel'tsov, in the similar way as in the asynchronous definition, compares only the spatial parts of $l_{rel}^{\mu'}$ and l_{rel}^μ and defines that the relativistic length in S' is $l'_{rel} \equiv l_{rel}^{1'}$, which is related with $l_{rel} \equiv l_{rel}^1$ in S by the "elongation formula" $l'_{rel} = \gamma l_{rel}$. These quantities $l_{rel}^{1'}$ and l_{rel}^1 are considered to be the same quantity for observers in S' and in S . It is argued in [19] that such "approach has a manifestly relativistic covariant character." But, as already said, the formulation of SR with true tensors (or the CBGQs), i.e., the "TT relativity," shows that comparison of only spatial (or temporal) parts of the components of the distance 4-vector l_{AB}^a in S and S' is physically meaningless. Thus $l_{rel}^{1'}$ and l_{rel}^1 are not the same quantity for observers in S' and in S . In general, as can be concluded from the preceding sections, the spatial or temporal distances are not well defined physical quantities in 4D spacetime. Consequently the radar formulation of SR, together with the asynchronous formulation and Einstein's formulation of SR, belongs to the "AT relativity." Having discussed different theoretical formulations of SR we can go to the comparison with experiments.

3 THE COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENTS

In numerous papers and textbooks it is considered that the experiments on "length contraction" and "time dilatation" test SR, but the discussion from the previous sections shows that such an interpretation of the experiments refers exclusively to the "AT relativity," and not to the "TT relativity." We have shown that when SR is understood as the theory of 4D spacetime with pseudo-Euclidean geometry then instead of the Lorentz contraction and the dilatation of time one has to consider the 4D tensor quantities, the spacetime length l (10), or the distance 4-vector $l_{AB}^a = x_B^a - x_A^a$. Namely in the "TT relativity" the measurements in different IFRs (and different coordinatizations) have to refer to the same 4D tensor quantity, i.e., to a CBGQ, (of course the same holds for the theory). In the chosen IFR and the chosen coordinatization (this choice defines what are the basis 4-vectors and 1-forms) the measurement of some 4D quantity has to contain the measurements of all parts (all the basis components) of such a quantity. However in almost all experiments that refer to SR only the quantities belonging to the "AT relativity" were measured. From the "TT relativity" viewpoint such measurements are incomplete, since only some parts of a 4D quantity, not all, are measured. This fact presents a serious difficulty in the reliable comparison of the existing experiments with the "TT relativity," and, actually, we shall be able to compare in a quantitative manner only some of the existing experiments with the "TT relativity." This will be examined in the comparison of the theoretical results for the spacetime length in the "TT relativity" and the spatial and temporal distances in the "AT relativity" with the existing experiments (see also [16]). We note that different test theories of SR have been proposed (see, e.g., [12] and references therein), but ultimately all of them use the time dilatation and length

contraction parameters. (For example, even in the recent test theory [20] which poses the question [20]: “.. how accurately the background spacetime of physical phenomena, at least locally, is a Minkowski spacetime?” the authors states in the abstract: “It is shown that the time dilatation and length contraction parameters measure the deviation from a Riemannian geometry.” Thence all of the existing test theories are not actually test theories of *SR*, but test theories of the usual “AT relativity” approach to SR. Our aim in the following sections, which deal with the comparison with experiments, is not the comparison of some test theories with experiments, but the comparison of the existing experimental results with different theoretical approaches to SR, i.e., with the usual “AT relativity” and the “TT relativity.” It will be shown that the “TT relativity” theoretical results agree with all experiments that are complete from the “TT relativity” viewpoint, i.e., in which all parts of the considered tensor quantity are measured in the experiment. However the “AT relativity” results agree only with some of the examined experiments and this agreement will exist only for the specific coordinatization, i.e., the “e” coordinatization.

4 THE “MUON” EXPERIMENT

First we shall examine an experiment in which different results will be predicted for different synchronizations in the conventional approach to SR, i.e., in the “AT relativity,” but of course the same results for all synchronizations will be obtained in the “TT relativity.” This is the “muon” experiment, which is theoretically discussed in Secs. 2.1 and 2.2. The “muon” experiment is quoted in almost every textbook on general physics, see, e.g., [21] and [22]. Moreover, an experiment [23] was the basis for a film often shown in introductory modern physics courses: “Time dilation: An experiment with μ mesons.”

In these experiments [23] (see also [24]) the fluxes of muons on a mountain, N_m , and at sea level, N_s , are measured, and the number of muons which decayed in flight is determined from their difference. Also the distribution of the decay times is measured for the case when the muons are at rest, giving a lifetime τ of approximately $2.2\mu s$. The rate of decay of muons at rest, i.e., in the muon frame, is compared with their rate of decay in flight, i.e., in the Earth frame. In [23] high-velocity muons are used, which causes that the fractional energy loss of the muons in the atmosphere is negligible, making it a constant velocity problem. The discussion of the “muon” experiment in Secs. 2.1 and 2.2 referred to the decay of only one particle. When the real experiments are considered, as in [23], then we use data on the decay of many such radioactive particles and the characteristic quantities are averaged over many single decay events.

4.1 The nonrelativistic approach

In the nonrelativistic theory the space and time are separated. The coordinate transformations connecting the Earth frame and the muon frame are the Galilean transformations giving that t_E , the travel time from the mountain to sea level when measured in the Earth frame, is the same as t_μ , which is the elapsed time for the same travelling but measured in the moving frame of the muon, $t_E = t_\mu$. Also, in the nonrelativistic theory, the lifetimes of muons in the mentioned two frames are equal, $\tau_E = \tau_\mu = \tau$. Muon counts on the mountain N_m , and at sea level N_s , as experimentally determined numbers, do not depend on the frame in which they are measured and on the chosen coordinatization. This result, i.e., that $N_{s\mu} = N_{sE} = N_s$ and $N_{m\mu} = N_{mE} = N_m$, has to be obtained not only in the nonrelativistic theory but also in the “AT relativity” and in the “TT relativity.” The differential equation for the radioactive-decay processes in the nonrelativistic theory can be written as

$$dN/dt = -\lambda N, \quad N_s = N_m \exp(-t/\tau). \quad (19)$$

The travel time t_E is not directly measured by clocks, but, in the Earth frame, it is determined as the ratio of the height of the mountain H_E and the velocity of the muons v , $t_E = H_E/v$. The equation (19) holds in the Earth frame and in the muon frame too, since the two frames are connected by the Galilean transformations, and, as mentioned above, the corresponding times are equal, $t_E = t_\mu$ and $\tau_E = \tau_\mu$. Hence we conclude that in the nonrelativistic theory the exponential factors are the same in both frames and consequently the corresponding fluxes in the two frames are equal, $N_{s\mu} = N_{sE}$ and $N_{m\mu} = N_{mE}$, as it must be. However the experiments show that the

actual flux at sea level is much higher than that expected from such a nonrelativistic calculation, and thus the nonrelativistic theory does not agree with the experimental results.

4.2 The usual "AT relativity" approach

In the "AT relativity" different physical phenomena in different IFRs must be invoked to explain the measured values of the fluxes; the time "dilatation" is used in the Earth frame, but in the muon frame one explains the data by means of the Lorentz "contraction." In order to exploit the results of Secs. 2.1 and 2.2 we analyse the "muon" experiment not only in the "e" coordinatization but also in the "r" coordinatization. As shown in Sec. 2.2 the "AT relativity" considers that the spatial and temporal parts of the spacetime length are well-defined physical quantities in 4D spacetime.

Then, as in the nonrelativistic theory, the equation for the radioactive-decay in the "AT relativity" can be written as

$$dN/dx^0 = -\lambda N, \quad N_s = N_m \exp(-\lambda x^0). \quad (20)$$

The equation (20) contains a specific coordinate, the x^0 coordinate, which means that the equation (20) will not remain unchanged upon the Lorentz transformation, i.e., it will not have the same form in different IFRs (and also in different coordinatizations). But in the "AT relativity" it is not required that the physical quantities must be the 4D tensor quantities that correctly transform upon the Lorentz transformations. Thus the quantities in (20) are not the 4D tensor quantities, i.e., they are not the true tensors or the CBGQs. This will cause that different phenomena in different IFRs will need to be invoked to explain the same physical effect, i.e., the same experimental data. In the Earth frame and in the "e" coordinatization we can write in (20) that $x_E^0 = ct_E$, $\lambda_E = 1/c\tau_E$, which gives that the radioactive-decay law becomes $N_{sE} = N_{mE} \exp(-t_E/\tau_E)$. In the experiments [23] N_{sE} , N_{mE} , and $t_E = H_E/v$ are measured in the Earth frame (tacitly assuming the "e" coordinatization). However the lifetime of muons is measured in their rest frame. Now, in contrast to the nonrelativistic theory where $\tau_E = \tau_\mu$ and $t_E = t_\mu$, the "AT relativity" assumes that in the "e" coordinatization there is the time "dilatation" determined by (17), which gives the connection between the lifetimes of muons in the Earth frame τ_E and the measured lifetime in the muon frame τ_μ as

$$\tau_E = \gamma \tau_\mu. \quad (21)$$

Using that relation one finds that the radioactive-decay law, when expressed in terms of the measured quantities, becomes

$$N_{sE} = N_{mE} \exp(-t_E/\tau_E) = N_{mE} \exp(-t_E/\gamma \tau_\mu). \quad (22)$$

This equation is used in [23] to make the "relativistic" calculation and compare it with the experimental data. In fact, in [23], the comparison is made between the predicted time dilatation factor γ of the muons and an observed γ . The predicted γ is 8.4 ± 2 , while the observed γ is found to be 8.8 ± 0.8 , which is a convincing agreement. The prediction of γ is made from the measured energies of muons on the mountain and at sea level; these energies are determined from the measured amount of material which muons penetrated when stopped, and then the energies are converted to the speeds of the muons using the relativistic relation between the total energy and the speed. The observed γ is determined from the relation (22), where the measured rates were $N_{sE} = 397 \pm 9$ and $N_{mE} = 550 \pm 10$, and the measured height of the mountain is $H_E = 1907m$. The lifetime of muons τ_μ in the muon frame is taken as the information from other experiments (in order to obtain more accurate result) and it is $\tau_\mu = 2.211 \cdot 10^{-6}s$.

Let us now see how the experiments are interpreted in the muon frame. (We note that [23] compared the theory (the "AT relativity") and the experiments only in the Earth frame, but using τ_μ from the muon frame.) First we have to find the form of the law for the radioactive-decay processes (20) in the muon frame. As considered above the radioactive-decay law $N_{sE} = N_{mE} \exp(-t_E/\tau_E)$ in the Earth frame and in the "e" coordinatization is obtained from the equation (20) using the relations $x_E^0 = ct_E$ and $\lambda_E = 1/c\tau_E$. But, as already said, the equation (20) does not remain unchanged upon the Lorentz transformation. Accordingly it cannot have the same form in the Earth frame and in the muon frame. So, actually, in the 4D spacetime, the equation for the

radioactive-decay processes in the muon frame could have, in principle, a different functional form than the equation (22), which describes the same radioactive- decay processes in the Earth frame. However, in the "AT relativity," despite of the fact that the quantities in the Earth frame and in the muon frame are not connected by the Lorentz transformations, the equation for the radioactive-decay processes in the muon frame is obtained from the equation (20) in the same way as in the Earth frame, i.e., writting that $x_\mu^0 = ct_\mu$, and $\lambda_\mu = 1/c\tau_\mu$, whence

$$N_{s\mu} = N_{m\mu} \exp(-t_\mu/\tau_\mu). \quad (23)$$

The justification for such a procedure can be done in the following way. In the "AT relativity" the principle of relativity acts as some sort of "Deus ex machina," which resolves problems; the relation (20) is *proclaimed* to be the physical law and the principle of relativity requires that a physical law must have the same form in different IFRs. (This is the usual way in which the principle of relativity is understood in the "AT relativity.") Therefore, one can write in the equation (20) that $x_E^0 = ct_E$ and $\lambda_E = 1/c\tau_E$ in the Earth frame and $x_\mu^0 = ct_\mu$, and $\lambda_\mu = 1/c\tau_\mu$ in the muon frame. With such substitutions the form of the law is the same in both frames, as it is required by the principle of relativity. Then, as we have already seen, when the consideration is done in the Earth frame, the relation (21) for the time dilatation is used to connect quantities in two frames, instead of to connect them by the Lorentz transformations. When the consideration is performed in the muon frame another relation is invoked to connect quantities in two frames. Namely it is considered in the "AT relativity" that in the muon frame the mountain is moving and the muon "sees" the height of the mountain Lorentz contracted,

$$H_\mu = H_E/\gamma, \quad (24)$$

which is Eq. (14) for the Lorentz contraction, giving that

$$t_\mu = H_\mu/v = H_E/\gamma v = t_E/\gamma. \quad (25)$$

This leads to the same exponential factor in (23) as that one in the Earth frame in (22), $\exp(-t_\mu/\tau_\mu) = \exp(-t_E/(\gamma\tau_\mu))$. From that result it is concluded that in the "AT relativity" and in the "e" coordinatization the corresponding fluxes are equal in the two frames, $N_{s\mu}=N_{sE} = N_s$ and $N_{m\mu} = N_{mE} = N_m$. Strictly speaking, it is not the mentioned equality of fluxes, but the equality of ratios of fluxes, $N_{sE}/N_{mE} = N_{s\mu}/N_{m\mu}$, which follows from the equality of the exponential factors in (22) and (23). In [23] the time t_μ that the muons spent in flight according to their own clocks was inferred from the measured distribution of decay times of muons at rest. Since the predicted fluxes N_{sE} and N_{mE} are in a satisfactory agreement with the measured ones, and since the theory (which deals with the time dilatation and the Lorentz contraction) predicts their independence on the chosen frame, it is generally accepted that the "AT relativity" correctly explains the measured data.

The above comparison is worked out only in the "e" coordinatization, but the physics demands that the independence of the fluxes on the chosen frame must hold in all permissible coordinatizations. Therefore we now discuss the experiments [23] from the point of view of the "AT relativity" but in the "r" coordinatization. Then, using (20), we can write the relation for the fluxes in the "r" coordinatization and in the Earth frame as

$$N_{r,sE} = N_{r,mE} \exp(-\lambda_{r,E} x_{r,E}^0) = N_{r,mE} \exp(-x_{r,E}^0/x_{r,E}^0(\tau_E)),$$

where $x_{r,E}^0(\tau_E) = 1/\lambda_{r,E}$. Again, as in the "e" coordinatization, we have to express $x_{r,E}^0(\tau_E)$ in the Earth frame in terms of the measured quantity $x_{r,\mu}^0(\tau_\mu)$ using the relation (18) for the time "dilatation" in the "r" coordinatization,

$$x_{r,E}^0(\tau_E) = (1 + 2\beta_r)^{1/2} c\tau_\mu.$$

Hence, the radioactive-decay law (20), in the "r" coordinatization, and when expressed in terms of the measured quantities, becomes

$$N_{r,sE} = N_{r,mE} \exp(-x_{r,E}^0/(1 + 2\beta_r)^{1/2} c\tau_\mu), \quad (26)$$

and it corresponds to the relation (22) in the "e" coordinatization. If we express β_r in terms of $\beta = v/c$ as $\beta_r = \beta/(1-\beta)$ (see (7)) and use (6) to connect the "r" and "e" coordinatizations, $x_{r,E}^0 = x_E^0 - x_E^1 = ct_E - H_E$, then the exponential factor in (26) becomes $= \exp \left\{ -(ct_E - H_E) / [(1+\beta)/(1-\beta)]^{1/2} c\tau_\mu \right\}$. Using $H_E = vt_E$ this exponential factor can be written in the form that resembles to that one in (22), i.e., it is $= \exp(-t_E/\Gamma_{rE}\tau_\mu)$, and (26) can be written as

$$N_{r,sE} = N_{r,mE} \exp(-t_E/\Gamma_{rE}\tau_\mu). \quad (27)$$

We see that $\gamma = (1-\beta)^{-1/2}$ in (22) (the "e" coordinatization) is replaced by a different factor

$$\Gamma_{rE} = (1+\beta)^{1/2}(1-\beta)^{-3/2} = (1+\beta)(1-\beta)^{-1}\gamma \quad (28)$$

in (27) (the "r" coordinatization). The *observed* Γ_{rE} in the experiments [23] must remain the same, the observed $\Gamma_{rE} = 8.8 \pm 0.8$, (it is determined from (27) with the measured values of $N_{r,sE}$, $N_{r,mE}$, t_E and τ_μ), but the *predicted* Γ_{rE} , using the above relation for Γ_r and the known, predicted, $\gamma = 8.4 \pm 2$, becomes $\simeq 250\gamma$,

$$\Gamma_{rE} \simeq 250\gamma. \quad (29)$$

We see that from the common point of view a quite unexpected result is obtained in the "r" coordinatization; the *observed* Γ_{rE} is as before $= 8.8$, while the *predicted* Γ_{rE} is $\simeq 250 \cdot 8.4 = 2100$. Similarly, one can show that there is a great discrepancy between the fluxes measured in [23] and the fluxes predicted when the "dilatation" of time is taken into account but in the "r" coordinatization and all is in the Earth frame. Furthermore, it can be easily proved that predicted values in the "r" coordinatization and in the muon frame will again greatly differ from the measured ones. *Such results explicitly show that the "AT relativity" is not a satisfactory relativistic theory; it predicts, e.g., different values of the flux N_s (for the same measured N_m) in different synchronizations and for some synchronizations these predicted values are quite different but the measured ones.* These results are directly contrary to the generally accepted opinion about the validity of the "AT relativity."

4.3 The "TT relativity" approach

Let us now examine the experiments [23] from the point of view of the "TT relativity." In the "TT relativity" all quantities entering into physical laws must be 4D tensor quantities, and thus with correct transformation properties; *the same 4D quantity* has to be considered in different IFRs and different coordinatizations. In the usual, "AT relativity," analysis of the "muon" experiment, for example, the lifetimes τ_E and τ_μ are considered as the same quantity. Although the transformation connecting τ_E and τ_μ (the dilatation of time (21)) is only *a part* of the Lorentz transformation written in the "e" coordinatization, it is believed by all proponents of the "AT relativity" that τ_E and τ_μ refer to the same temporal distance (the same quantity) but measured by the observers in two relatively moving IFRs. However, as shown in the preceding sections and in [1] (see Fig.4), in 4D spacetime τ_E and τ_μ refer to different quantities, which are not connected by the Lorentz transformation. To paraphrase Gamba [7]: "As far as relativity is concerned, quantities like τ_E and τ_μ are different quantities, not necessarily related to one another. To ask the relation between τ_E and τ_μ from the point of view of relativity, is like asking what is the relation between the measurement of the radius of the Earth made by an observer S and the measurement of the radius of Venus made by an observer S' . We can certainly take the ratio of the two measures; what is wrong is the tacit assumption that relativity has something to do with the problem just because the measurements were made by *two* observers."

Hence, in the "TT relativity," instead of the equation (20), which explicitly contains only the specific coordinate, x^0 coordinate, we formulate the radioactive-decay law in terms of true tensor quantities, i.e., the CBGQs, as

$$dN/dl = -\lambda N, \quad N = N_0 \exp(-\lambda l). \quad (30)$$

l is the spacetime length defined by (10), where $l^a(l^b)$ is the distance 4-vector between two events A and B , $l^a = l_{AB}^a = x_B^a - x_A^a$. $x_{A,B}^a$ are the position 4-vectors for the events of creation of

muons (here on the mountain; we denote it as the event O) and their arrival (here at sea level; the event A). $\lambda = 1/l(\tau)$; $l(\tau)$ is the spacetime length for the events of creation of muons (here on the mountain; the event O) and their decay after the lifetime τ , the event T . l , defined in such a way, is a geometrical quantity. Then in the "e" coordinatization and in the muon frame the distance 4-vector l_{OA}^a , when written as the CBGQ, becomes $l_{\mu,OA}^a = ct_\mu e_0 + 0e_1$ (the subscript μ will be used, as previously in this section, to denote the quantities in the muon frame, while Greek indices α, β denote the components of some geometric object, e.g., the components $l_{\mu,OA}^\alpha$ in the muon frame of the distance 4-vector l_{OA}^a), and the spacetime length l between these events is $l_{OA} = (l_{\mu,OA}^\beta l_{\mu,\beta OA})^{1/2} = (-c^2 t_\mu^2)^{1/2}$. The distance 4-vector l_{OT}^a written as the CBGQ in the "e" coordinatization and in the muon frame is $l_{\mu,OT}^a = c\tau_\mu e_0 + 0e_1$, whence the spacetime length $l_{OT} = (l_{\mu,OT}^\beta l_{\mu,\beta OT})^{1/2} = (-c^2 \tau_\mu^2)^{1/2}$. Inserting the spacetime lengths l_{OA} and l_{OT} into the equation (30) we find the expression for the radioactive-decay law in the "TT relativity"

$$N_s = N_m \exp(-l_{OA}/l_{OT}), \quad (31)$$

which in the "e" coordinatization and in the muon frame takes the same form as the relation (23) (the radioactive-decay law in the "AT relativity" in the "e" coordinatization and in the muon frame),

$$N_s = N_m \exp(-l_{OA}/l_{OT}) = N_m \exp(-t_\mu/\tau_\mu). \quad (32)$$

Since the spacetime length l is independent on the chosen IFR and on the chosen coordinatization *the relation (31) holds in the same form in the Earth frame and in the muon frame and in both coordinatizations, the "e" and "r" coordinatizations*. Hence we do not need to examine Eq. (31) in the Earth frame, and in the "r" coordinatization, but we can simply compare the relation (32) with the experiments. (The relation (11) gives the distance 4-vectors l_{OA}^a and l_{OT}^a written as the CBGQs in the "e" coordinatization in the muon frame (the S frame) and in the Earth frame (the S' frame) and similarly happens with Eq. (12) in the "r" coordinatization.)

Thus we conclude that, in order to check the validity of the "TT relativity" in the "muon" experiment, we would need, strictly speaking, to measure, e.g., the lifetime τ_μ and the time t_μ in the muon frame, where they determine l_{OT} and l_{OA} respectively, and then to measure *the same events* (that determined τ_μ and t_μ in the muon frame) in an IFR that is in uniform motion relative to the muon frame (at us it is the Earth frame). Of course it is not possible to do so in the real "muon" experiment but, nevertheless, in this case we can use the data from experiments [23] and interpret them as that they were obtained in the way required by the "TT relativity." The reasons for such a conclusion are the identity of microparticles of the same sort, the assumed homogeneity and isotropy of the spacetime, and some other reasons that are actually discussed in [23] (although from another point of view). Here we shall not discuss this, in principle, a very complex question, than we take the measured values of τ_μ , t_μ , N_s and N_m and compare them with the results predicted by the relation (32). In [23] τ_μ is taken to be $\tau_\mu = 2.211\mu s$, $N_s = 397 \pm 9$, $N_m = 550 \pm 10$, but t_μ is not measured than it is estimated from Fig. 6(a) in [23] to be $t_\mu = 0.7\mu s$. Inserting the values of τ_μ , t_μ and N_m from [23] (for this simple comparison we take only the mean values without errors) into (32) we predict that N_s is $N_s = 401$, which is in an excellent agreement with the measured $N_s = 397$. As it is already said, the spacetime length l takes the same value in both frames and both coordinatizations, $l_{e,\mu} = l_{e,E} = l_{r,\mu} = l_{r,E}$. Hence, for the measured $N_m = 550$ and if the distance 4-vectors l_{OA}^a and l_{OT}^a would be measured in the Earth frame, and in both frames in the "r" coordinatization, we would find the same $N_s = 401$. This result undoubtedly confirms the consistency and the validity of the "TT relativity."

The nonrelativistic theory predicts the same value of the exponential factor in both frames, $\exp(-t_E/\tau_E) = \exp(-t_\mu/\tau_\mu)$, since it deals with the absolute time, i.e., with the Galilean transformations. But, for the measured N_m the nonrelativistic theory predicts too small N_s . The "AT relativity" correctly predicts the value of N_s in both frames but only in the "e" coordinatization, while in the "r" coordinatization the experimental N_s and the theoretically predicted N_s drastically differ. The "TT relativity" completely agrees with the experiments in all IFRs and all permissible coordinatizations. Thus, the "TT relativity," as the theory of 4D spacetime with the pseudo-Euclidean geometry, is in a complete agreement with the experiments.

4.4 Another time "dilatation" experiments

The same conclusion can be achieved comparing the other particle lifetime measurements, e.g., [25], or for the pion lifetime [26], with all three theories. However, as it is already said, all the mentioned experiments, and not only them but all other too, were designed to test the "AT relativity." Thus in the experiments [25], which preceded to the experiments [23] and [24], the relation similar to (22) is used but with t_E replaced by $H_E (=vt_E)$ and τ_E (the lifetime of muons in the Earth frame) replaced by $L = v\tau_E$ (L is the "average range before decay"), and also the connection between the lifetimes (21) ($\tau_E = \gamma\tau_\mu$) is employed. Obviously the *predictions* of the results in the experiments [25] will depend on the chosen synchronization, since they deal with the "AT relativity" and use the radioactive-decay law in the form that contains only a part of the distance 4-vector. The *predictions* obtained by the use of the "TT relativity" will be again independent on the chosen IFR and the chosen coordinatization. However the comparison of these experiments [25] with the "TT relativity" is difficult since, e.g., they have no data for t_μ . Similarly happens with the experiments reported in [26].

The lifetime measurements of muons in the g-2 experiments [27] are often quoted as the most convincing evidence for the time dilatation, i.e., they are claimed as high-precision evidence for SR. Namely in the literature the evidence for the time dilatation is commonly considered as the evidence for SR. The muon lifetime in flight τ is determined by fitting the experimental decay electron time distribution to the six-parameter phenomenological function describing the normal modulated exponential decay spectrum (their Eq.(1)). Then by the use of the relation $\tau = \gamma\tau_0$ and of τ_0 (our τ_μ), the lifetime at rest (as determined by other workers), they obtained the time-dilatation factor γ , or the kinematical γ . This γ is compared with the corresponding dynamical γ factor ($\gamma = (p/m)dp/dE$), which they called $\bar{\gamma}$ (the average γ value). $\bar{\gamma}$ is determined from the mean rotation frequency $\bar{f}_{rot}$ by the use of the Lorentz force law (the "relativistic" expression); the magnetic field was measured in terms of the proton NMR frequency f_p (for the discussion of $g - 2$ experiments within the traditional "AT relativity" see also [28]). Limits of order 10^{-3} in $(\gamma - \bar{\gamma})/\gamma$ at the kinematical $\gamma = 29.3$ were set. In that way they also compared the value of the μ^+ lifetime at rest τ_0^+ (from the other precise measurements) with the value found in their experiment $\tau^+/\bar{\gamma}$, and obtained $(\tau_0^+ - \tau^+/\bar{\gamma})/\tau_0^+ = (2 \pm 9) \times 10^{-4}$, (this is the same comparison as the mentioned comparison of γ with $\bar{\gamma}$). They claimed: "At 95% confidence the fractional difference between τ_0^+ and $\tau^+/\bar{\gamma}$ is in the range $(-1.6 - 2.0) \times 10^{-3}$." and "To date, this is the most accurate test of relativistic time dilation using elementary particles." The objections to the precision of the experiments [27], and the remark that a convincing direct test of SR must not assume the validity of SR in advance (in the use of the "relativistic" Lorentz force law in the determination of the mean rotation frequency and thus of $\bar{\gamma}$, and τ_0), have been raised in [29]. The discussion of these objections is given in [30].

However, our objections to [27] are of a quite different nature. Firstly, the theoretical relations refer to the "e" coordinatization and, e.g., Eq.(1) in the first paper in [27] cannot be transformed in an appropriate way to the "r" coordinatization in order to compare the "AT relativity" in different coordinatizations with the experiments. If only the exponential factor is considered then this factor is again, as in [23], affected by synchrony choice. Although the time t in that exponential factor may be independent of the chosen synchronization (when t is taken to be the multiple of the mean rotation period T), but τ does not refer to the events that happen at the same spatial point and thus it is synchrony dependent quantity. This means that in the "r" coordinatization one cannot use the relation $\tau = \gamma\tau_0$ to find the "dilatation" factor γ , but the relation (18) for the time "dilatation" in the "r" coordinatization, $x_r^0(\tau) = (1 + 2\beta_r)^{1/2}c\tau_0$ must be employed. Hence, the whole comparison of γ with $\bar{\gamma}$ holds only in the "e" coordinatization; in another coordinatization the "AT relativity" predicts quite different τ_0 for the same $x^0(\tau)$ (that is inferred from the exponential decay spectrum).

Let us now examine the measurements [27] from the point of view of the "TT relativity." But for the "TT relativity" these experiments are incomplete and cannot be compared with the theory. Namely, in the "TT relativity," as already said, it is not possible to find the values of the muon lifetime in flight τ by analyses of the measurements of the radioactive decay distribution, since, there, the radioactive decay law is written in terms of the spacetime lengths and not with t and τ . Also, in the "TT relativity," there is not the connection between the muon lifetime in flight τ

and the lifetime at rest τ_0 in the form $\tau = \gamma\tau_0$, since τ , in the "TT relativity," does not exist as a well defined quantity. Thus, in the "TT relativity," there is no sense in the use of the relation $\tau = \gamma\tau_0$ to determine γ . An important remark is in place here; in principle, in the "TT relativity," the same events and the same quantities have to be considered in different frames of reference. This means that in the muon experiment [27] the lifetime at rest τ_0 refers to the decaying particle in an accelerated frame and for the theoretical discussion we would need to use the coordinate transformations connecting an IFR with an accelerated frame of reference. (An example of the generalized Lorentz transformation is given in [31] but they are written in the "e" coordinatization and thus not in fully covariant way, i.e., not in the way as we have written the covariant Lorentz transformation (1).) Furthermore, in the experiments [27] the average value of γ ($\bar{\gamma}$), i.e., the dynamical γ , for the circulating muons is found by analysis of the bunch structure of the stored muon and the use of the relation connecting $\bar{\gamma}$ and the mean rotation frequency $\bar{f}_{rot}$. This relation is obtained by the use of the expression for the "relativistic," i.e., the "AT relativity," Lorentz force law, which is expressed by means of the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$. However, in contrast to the "AT relativity," and also to the usual covariant formulation, in the "TT relativity," the Lorentz force as the true tensor $K^a = (q/c)F^{ab}u_b$ (F^{ab} is the electromagnetic field tensor and u^b is the 4-velocity of a charge q , see [8], [32] and [1]) cannot be expressed in terms of the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$. Namely in the "AT relativity" the real physical meaning is attributed not to F^{ab} but to the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, while in the "TT relativity" only the true tensor quantities, or equivalently the CBGQs, do have well-defined physical meaning both in the theory and in experiments. (The transformations of the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ are not directly connected with the Lorentz transformations of the *whole 4D tensor quantity* F^{ab} as a geometrical quantity, but indirectly through the transformations of *some components* of F^{ab} , and that happens in the *specific coordinatization, the Einstein coordinatization*. This issue is discussed in detail in [1], where it is also shown that the 3-vector $\mathbf{E}$ ($\mathbf{B}$) in an IFR S and the transformed 3-vector $\mathbf{E}'$ ($\mathbf{B}'$) in relatively moving IFR S' do not refer to the same physical quantity in 4D spacetime, i.e., that the conventional transformations of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ are the AT.)

>From [32] and [1] one can see how the Lorentz force K^a is expressed in terms of the 4-vectors E^a and B^a and show when this form corresponds to the classical expression for the Lorentz force with the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$. Also it can be seen from [1] and [33] that for $B^\alpha \neq 0$ (B^α is the component form of B^a in the "e" coordinatization) it is not possible to obtain $\gamma_u = 1$ (the 4-velocity of a charge q in the "e" coordinatization is $u^\alpha = (\gamma_u c, \gamma_u \mathbf{u})$ and $\gamma_u = (1 - u^2/c^2)^{-1/2}$), and the invariant Lorentz force K^a can never take the form of the usual magnetic force $\mathbf{F}_B$. Hence it follows that in the "TT relativity" it is not possible to use the Lorentz force $\mathbf{F}_B$ and the usual equation of motion $d(\bar{\gamma}m\mathbf{u})/dt = q(\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{B})$ to find the relation connecting $\bar{\gamma}$ and the mean rotation frequency $\bar{f}_{rot}$, and thus to find τ_0 from $\tau/\bar{\gamma}$, in the way as in [27]. The discussion about the kinematical γ (the relation $\tau = \gamma\tau_0$) and about the dynamical $\bar{\gamma}$ (from the use of the Lorentz force) shows that the measurements [27] cannot be compared with the "TT relativity." But, as we explained before, in contrast to the usual opinion, these experiments do not confirm the "AT relativity" either. Namely if the exponential decay spectrum is analyzed in another coordinatization, e.g., the "r" coordinatization, then, similarly as for the experiments [23], one finds that for the given N_0 the theoretical and the experimental N differ.

5 THE MICHELSON-MORLEY EXPERIMENT

These conclusions will be further supported considering some other experiments, which, customarily, were assumed to confirm the usual "AT relativity," that is, the Einstein formulation of SR. The first one will be the famous Michelson-Morley experiment [34], and some modern versions of this experiment will be also discussed. Since the Michelson-Morley experiment is considered in detail in [2] we only briefly discuss some results.

In the Michelson-Morley experiment two light beams emitted by one source are sent, by half-silvered mirror O , in orthogonal directions. These partial beams of light traverse the two equal (of the length L) and perpendicular arms OM_1 (perpendicular to the motion) and OM_2 (in the line of motion) of Michelson's inteferometer and the behaviour of the interference fringes produced on bringing together these two beams after reflection on the mirrors M_1 and M_2 is examined. In order to avoid the influence of the effect that the two lengths of arms are not exactly equal the entire

interferometer is rotated through 90^0 . Then any small difference in length becomes unimportant. The experiment consists of looking for a shift of the interference fringes as the apparatus is rotated. The expected maximum shift in the number of fringes (the measured quantity) on a 90^0 rotation is

$$\Delta N = \Delta(\phi_2 - \phi_1)/2\pi, \quad (33)$$

where $\Delta(\phi_2 - \phi_1)$ is the change in the phase difference when the interferometer is rotated through 90^0 . ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are the phases of waves moving along the paths OM_1O and OM_2O , respectively.

5.1 The "TT relativity" approach

The Michelson-Morley experiment will be examined from the "TT relativity" viewpoint and then it will be shown how the usual "AT relativity" results are obtained. The relevant quantity is the phase of a light wave, and it is (when written in the abstract index notation)

$$\phi = k^a g_{ab} l^b, \quad (34)$$

where k^a is the propagation 4-vector, g_{ab} is the metric tensor and l^b is the distance 4-vector. All quantities in (34) are true tensor quantities. As discussed in Sec. 2 these quantities can be written in the coordinate-based geometric language and, e.g., the decompositions of k^a in S and S' and in the "e" and "r" coordinatizations are

$$k^a = k^{\mu'} e_{\mu'} = k^\mu e_\mu = k_r^{\mu'} r_{\mu'} = k_r^\mu r_\mu, \quad (35)$$

where the basis components k^μ of the CBGQ in the "e" coordinatization are transformed by $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,e}$ (2), while the basis vectors e_μ are transformed by the inverse transformation $(L^{\mu'}_{\nu,e})^{-1} = L^{\mu}_{\nu',e}$. Similarly holds for the "r" coordinatization where the Lorentz transformation $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,r}$ (7) has to be used. By the same reasoning the phase ϕ (34) is given in the coordinate-based geometric language as

$$\phi = k_e^\mu g_{\mu\nu,e} l_e^\nu = k_e^{\mu'} g_{\mu\nu,e} l_e^{\nu'} = k_r^\mu g_{\mu\nu,r} l_r^\nu = k_r^{\mu'} g_{\mu\nu,r} l_r^{\nu'}, \quad (36)$$

(Note that the Lorentz transformation $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,e}$ (2) and also $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,r}$ (7) are the TT, i.e., the isometries, and hence $g_{\mu\nu,e} = g_{\mu'\nu',e}$, $g_{\mu\nu,r} = g_{\mu'\nu',r}$, what is already taken into account in (36).) The traditional derivation of ΔN (see [2] and, e.g., [21], [22], or an often cited paper on modern tests of special relativity [35]) deals only with the calculation of t_1 and t_2 in S and t'_1 and t'_2 in S' , but does not take into account either the changes in frequencies due to the Doppler effect or the aberration of light. (The Earth frame is the rest frame of the interferometer, i.e., it is the S frame, while the S' frame is the (preferred) frame in which the interferometer is moving at velocity $\mathbf{v}$. In the S frame t_1 and t_2 are the times required for the complete trips OM_1O and OM_2O respectively, while t'_1 and t'_2 are the corresponding times in S' .) The "AT relativity" calculations [36] and [37] improve the traditional procedure taking into account the changes in frequencies [36] and the aberration of light [37]. But all these approaches explain the experiments using the AT, the Lorentz contraction and the time dilatation, and furthermore they always work only in the "e" coordinatization. None of the "AT relativity" calculations deal with the true tensors or with the CBGQs (comprising both components and a basis). In this case such 4D tensor quantity is the phase (34) or (36). *In the "TT relativity" approach to SR neither the Doppler effect nor the aberration of light exist separately as well defined physical phenomena. The separate contributions to ϕ (34), or (36), of the ωt (i.e., $k^0 l_0$) factor [36] and $\mathbf{kl}$ (i.e., $k^i l_i$) factor [37] are, in general case, meaningless in the "TT relativity."* From the "TT relativity" viewpoint only their indivisible unity, the phase ϕ (34), or (36), is a correctly defined 4D quantity. All quantities in (34), i.e., k^a , g_{ab} , l^b and ϕ , are the true tensor quantities, which means that in all relatively moving IFRs and in all permissible coordinatizations always *the same 4D quantity*, e.g., k^a , or l^b , or ϕ , is considered. (Eq. (36) shows it for ϕ .) This is not the case in the "AT relativity." There, for example, the relation for the time dilatation $t'_1 = \gamma t_1$, which is used in the usual explanation (see, e.g., [21], [22] and [35]) of the Michelson-Morley experiment, is not the Lorentz transformation of some 4D quantity, and t'_1 and t_1 do not correspond to the same 4D quantity considered in S' and S respectively but to different 4D quantities, as can be clearly seen from Sec. 2.2 (see 17). Only in the "e" coordinatization the ωt and $\mathbf{kl}$ factors can be considered separately. Therefore, and in order to retain the similarity with

the prerelativistic and the "AT relativity" considerations, we first determine ϕ (34), (36), in the "e" coordinatization and in the S frame (the rest frame of the interferometer). This means that ϕ will be calculated from (36) as the CBGQ $\phi = k_e^\mu g_{\mu\nu,e} l_e^\nu$.

Let now A , B and A_1 denote the events; the departure of the transverse ray from the half-silvered mirror O , the reflection of this ray on the mirror M_1 and the arrival of this beam of light after the round trip on the half-silvered mirror O , respectively. In the same way we have, for the longitudinal arm of the interferometer, the corresponding events A , C and A_2 . To simplify the notation we omit the subscript 'e' in all quantities. Then k_{AB}^μ and l_{AB}^μ (the basis components of k_{AB}^μ and l_{AB}^μ in the "e" coordinatization and in S) for the wave on the trip OM_1 (the events A and B) are $k_{AB}^\mu = (\omega/c, 0, 2\pi/\lambda, 0)$, $l_{AB}^\mu = (ct_{M_1}, 0, \bar{L}, 0)$. For the wave on the return trip M_1O , (the events B and A_1) $k_{BA_1}^\mu = (\omega/c, 0, -2\pi/\lambda, 0)$ and $l_{BA_1}^\mu = (ct_{M_1}, 0, -\bar{L}, 0)$ (the elapsed times t_{OM_1} and t_{M_1O} for the trips OM_1 and M_1O respectively are equal and denoted as t_{M_1} , $t_{OM_1} = t_{M_1O} = t_{M_1}$). Hence the increment of phase ϕ_1 for the the round trip OM_1O , is

$$\phi_1 = k_{AB}^\mu l_{\mu AB} + k_{BA_1}^\mu l_{\mu BA_1} = 2(-\omega t_{M_1} + (2\pi/\lambda)\bar{L}), \quad (37)$$

where ω is the angular frequency. L is the length of the segment OM_2 and $\bar{L} = L(1 + \varepsilon)$ ($\varepsilon \ll 1$) is taken to be, as in [36], the length of the arm OM_1 . As explained in [36]: "The difference $\bar{L} - L = \varepsilon L$ is usually a few wavelengths (< 25) and is essential for obtaining useful interference fringes." L , $\bar{L}$ and ν are determined in S , the rest frame of the interferometer. Using the Lorentz transformation $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,e}$ (2) one can find $k^{\mu'}$ and $l^{\mu'}$ in the "e" coordinatization and in S' for the same trips as in S . Then it can be easily shown that ϕ'_1 in S' is the same as in S , $\phi'_1 = \phi_1$. Also using the transformation matrix $T^{\mu}_{\nu,r}$ (5), which transforms the "e" coordinatization to the "r" coordinatization, one can get all quantities in the "r" coordinatization and in S , and then by the Lorentz transformation $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,r}$ (7) these quantities can be determined in the "r" coordinatization and in S' . ϕ_1 will be always the same in accordance with (36). Note that $g_{\mu\nu,r}$ (4) from Sec. 2 has to be used in the calculation of ϕ in the "r" coordinatization. As an example we quote $k_{AB,r}^\mu$ and $l_{AB,r}^\mu$: $k_{AB,r}^\mu = ((\omega/c) - 2\pi/\lambda, 0, 2\pi/\lambda, 0)$ and $l_{AB,r}^\mu = (ct_{M_1} - \bar{L}, 0, \bar{L}, 0)$. Hence, using $g_{\mu\nu,r}$ one easily finds that

$$\phi_{AB,r} = k_r^\mu g_{\mu\nu,r} l_r^\nu = (-\omega t_{M_1} + (2\pi/\lambda)\bar{L}) = \phi_{AB,e}.$$

For further purposes we shall also need $k_{AB,r}^{\mu'}$ and $l_{AB,r}^{\mu'}$. They are $k_{AB,r}^{\mu'} = ((\gamma\omega/c)(1 + \beta) - 2\pi/\lambda, -\beta\gamma\omega/c, 2\pi/\lambda, 0)$ and $l_{AB,r}^{\mu'} = (\gamma ct_{M_1}(1 + \beta) - \bar{L}, -\beta\gamma ct_{M_1}, \bar{L}, 0)$ which yields

$$\phi'_{AB,r} = \phi_{AB,r} = \phi'_{AB,e} = \phi_{AB,e}.$$

In a like manner we find k_{AC}^μ and l_{AC}^μ for the wave on the trip OM_2 , (the corresponding events are A and C) as $k_{AC}^\mu = (\omega/c, 2\pi/\lambda, 0, 0)$ and $l_{AC}^\mu = (ct_{M_2}, L, 0, 0)$. For the wave on the return trip M_2O (the corresponding events are C and A_2) $k_{CA_2}^\mu = (\omega/c, -2\pi/\lambda, 0, 0)$ and $l_{CA_2}^\mu = (ct_{M_2}, -L, 0, 0)$ ($t_{OM_2} = t_{M_2O} = t_{M_2}$), whence

$$\phi_2 = k_{AC}^\mu l_{\mu AC} + k_{CA_2}^\mu l_{\mu CA_2} = 2(-\omega t_{M_2} + (2\pi/\lambda)L). \quad (38)$$

Of course one finds the same ϕ_2 in S and S' and in the "e" and "r" coordinatizations. Hence

$$\phi_1 - \phi_2 = -2\omega(t_{M_1} - t_{M_2}) + 2(2\pi/\lambda)(\bar{L} - L). \quad (39)$$

Particularly for $\bar{L} = L$, and consequently $t_{M_1} = t_{M_2}$, one finds $\phi_1 - \phi_2 = 0$. It can be easily shown that the same difference of phase (39) is obtained in the case when the interferometer is rotated through 90° , whence we find that $\Delta(\phi_1 - \phi_2) = 0$, and $\Delta N = 0$. *According to the construction ϕ (34), or (36), is a frame independent quantity and it also does not depend on the chosen coordinatization in a considered IFR.* Thus we conclude that

$$\Delta N_e = \Delta N'_e = \Delta N_r = \Delta N'_r = 0. \quad (40)$$

This result is in a complete agreement with the Michelson-Morley [34] experiment.

Driscoll [36] improved the traditional "AT relativity" derivation of the fringe shift taking into account the changes in frequencies due to the Doppler effect. This improvement resulted in a "surprising" non-null fringe shift

$$\Delta N' = \Delta(\phi'_2 - \phi'_1)/2\pi = 4(L\nu/c)\beta^2, \quad (41)$$

and we see that the entire fringe shift is due to the Doppler shift (see [36] and [2]). It is explicitly shown in [2] that Driscoll's result *can be easily obtained from our "TT relativity" approach taking only the product $k_e^{0'}l_{0'e}$ in the calculation of the increment of phase ϕ'_e in S' in which the apparatus is moving.*

We remark that the non-null fringe shift (41) would be quite different in another coordinatization, e.g., in the "r" coordinatization, since only a part $k_e^{0'}l_{0'e}$ of the whole 4D tensor quantity ϕ (34) or (36) is considered. Thus when only a part of the whole phase ϕ (34) or (36) is taken into account then it leads to an unphysical result.

As shown in [2] *the same calculation of $k^{i'}l_{i'}$, the contribution of the spatial parts of $k^{\mu'}$ and $l_{\mu'}$ to $\Delta N'_e$, shows that this term exactly cancel the $k_e^{0'}l_{0'e}$ contribution (Driscoll's non-null fringe shift (41)), yielding that $\Delta N'_e = \Delta N_e = 0$.* Thus the "TT relativity" approach to SR naturally explains the reason for the existence of Driscoll's non-null fringe shift (41).

The results of the usual "AT relativity" calculation *can be easily explained from our true tensor formulation of SR taking only the part $k_e^0l_{0e}$ of the whole phase ϕ (34) or (36) in the calculation of the increment of phase ϕ'_e in S' .* In contrast to Driscoll's treatment the traditional analysis considers the part $k_e^0l_{0e}$ (of the whole phase ϕ (34), (36)) in S , the rest frame of the interferometer, and $k_e^{0'}l_{0'e}$ in S' , in which the apparatus is moving. *k_e^0 is not changed in transition from S to S' .* Thus the increment of phase ϕ_1 for the round trip OM_1O in S , is

$$\phi_1 = k_{AB}^0 g_{00,e} l_{AB}^0 + k_{BA_1}^0 g_{00,e} l_{BA_1}^0 = -2(\omega/c)(ct_{M_1}) = -2\omega t_{M_1}. \quad (42)$$

In the S' frame we find for the same trip that

$$\phi'_1 = k_{AB}^{0'} l_{0'AB} + k_{BA_1}^{0'} l_{0'BA_1} = -2(\omega/c)(\gamma ct_{M_1}) = -2\omega(\gamma t_{M_1}). \quad (43)$$

This is exactly the result obtained in the traditional analysis (see [21] or [22]) which is interpreted as that there is a time "dilatation" $t'_1 = \gamma t_1$. In the same way we find that the increment of phase ϕ_2 for the round trip OM_2O in S , is

$$\phi_2 = k_{AC}^0 l_{0AC} + k_{CA_2}^0 l_{0CA_2} = -2\omega t_{M_2}, \quad (44)$$

and ϕ'_2 in S' is

$$\phi'_2 = k_{AC}^{0'} l_{0'AC} + k_{CA_2}^{0'} l_{0'CA_2} = -2(\omega/c)(\gamma ct_{M_2}) = -2\omega(\gamma t_{M_2}). \quad (45)$$

This is again the result of the traditional analysis, the time "dilatation," $t'_2 = \gamma t_2$. For $t_1 = t_2$, i.e., for $\bar{L} = L$, one finally finds the null fringe shift that is obtained in the traditional analysis $\Delta N'_e = \Delta N_e = 0$. We see that *such a null fringe shift is obtained taking into account only a part of the whole phase ϕ (34) or (36), and additionally, in that part, k_e^0 is not changed in transition from S to S' .* Obviously this correct result follows from a physically incorrect treatment of the phase ϕ (34) or (36). Furthermore it has to be noted that the usual calculation is always done only in the "e" coordinatization.

Since only the part $k_e^0l_{0e}$ of the whole phase ϕ (34) or (36) is taken into account (and also $k_e^{0'} = k_e^0$) the results of the usual "AT relativity" calculation are coordinatization dependent. We explicitly show it using the "r" coordinatization.

In the "r" coordinatization the increment of phase ϕ_r is calculated from $\phi_r = k_r^0 g_{00,r} l_r^0$ in S and from $\phi'_r = k_r^{0'} g_{00,r} l_r^{0'}$ in S' . Hence we find that ϕ_{1r} for the round trip OM_1O in S is

$$\phi_{1r} = -2(\omega t_{M_1} + (2\pi/\lambda)\bar{L}), \quad (46)$$

and ϕ_{2r} for the round trip OM_2O in S is

$$\phi_{2r} = -2(\omega t_{M_2} + (2\pi/\lambda)L). \quad (47)$$

For $\bar{L} = L$, and consequently $t_{M_1} = t_{M_2}$, we find that $\phi_{1r} - \phi_{2r} = 0$, whence $\Delta N_r = 0$. Remark that the phases ϕ_{1r} and ϕ_{2r} differ from the corresponding phases ϕ_{1e} and ϕ_{2e} in the "e" coordinatization. As shown above this is not the case when the whole phase ϕ (34) or (36) is taken into account.

However, in S' , we find for the same trips that

$$\phi'_{1r} = -2(\gamma\omega t_{M_1}(1 + \beta) + (2\pi/\lambda)\bar{L}), \quad (48)$$

$$\phi'_{2r} = -2\gamma^2(1 + \beta^2)(\omega t_{M_2} + (2\pi/\lambda)L). \quad (49)$$

Obviously $\phi'_{1r} - \phi'_{2r} \neq 0$ and consequently it leads to *the non-null fringe shift*

$$\Delta N'_r \neq 0, \quad (50)$$

which holds even in the case when $t_{M_1} = t_{M_2}$. This result clearly shows that the agreement between the usual "AT relativity" calculation and the Michelson-Morley experiment is only an "apparent" agreement. It is achieved by an incorrect procedure and it holds only in the "e" coordinatization. We also remark that the traditional analysis, i.e., the "AT relativity," gives different values for the phases, e.g., ϕ_{1e} , ϕ'_{1e} , ϕ_{1r} and ϕ'_{1r} , since only a part of the whole phase ϕ (34) or (36) is considered. *These phases are frame and coordinatization dependent quantities. When the whole phase ϕ (34) or (36) is taken into account, i.e., in "TT relativity," all the mentioned phases are exactly equal quantities; they are the same, frame and coordinatization independent, quantity.*

5.2 The modern laser versions

The modern laser versions of the Michelson-Morley experiment, e.g., [38] and [39], are always interpreted according to the "AT relativity." They rely on highly monochromatic (maser) laser frequency metrology rather than optical interferometry; the measured quantity is not the maximum shift in the number of fringes than a beat frequency variation and the associated (maser) laser-frequency shift. In [38] the authors recorded the variations in beat frequency between two optical maser oscillators when rotated through 90° in space; the two maser cavities are placed orthogonally on a rotating table and they can be considered as two light clocks. It is stated in [38] that the highly monochromatic frequencies of masers; "...allow very sensitive detection of any change in the round-trip optical distance between two reflecting surfaces." and that the comparison of the frequencies of two masers allows: "...a very precise examination of the isotropy of space with respect to light propagation." The result of this experiment was: "... there was no relative variation in the maser frequencies associated with orientation of the earth in space greater than about 3 kc/sec." Similarly [39] compares the frequencies of a He-Ne laser locked to the resonant frequency of a highly stable Fabry-Perot cavity (the meter-stick, i.e., "etalon of length") and of a CH_4 stabilized "telescope-laser" frequency reference system. The beat frequency of the isolation laser (CH_4 stabilized-laser) with the cavity-stabilized laser was the measured quantity; a beat frequency variation is considered when the direction of the cavity length is rotated. The authors of [39], in the same way as [38], consider their experiment as: "isotropy of space experiment." Namely it is stated in [39] that: "Rotation of the entire electro-optical system maps any cosmic directional anisotropy of space into a corresponding frequency variation." They found a null result, i.e., a fractional length change of $\Delta l/l = (1.5 \pm 2.5) \times 10^{-15}$ (this is also the fractional frequency shift) in showing the isotropy of space; this result represented a 4000-fold improvement on the measurements [38]. In [35] the experiment [39] is quoted as the most precise repetition of the Michelson-Morley experiment, and it is asserted that the experiment [39] constrained the two times, our t'_1 and t'_2 , to be equal within a fractional error of 10^{-15} . The times t'_1 and t'_2 refer to the round-trips in two maser cavities in [38], and to the round-trips in the Fabry-Perot cavity in [39]. These times are calculated in the same way as in the Michelson-Morley experiment. (see, for example, [35]).

The above brief discussion of the experiments [38] and [39], and the previous analysis of the usual, "AT relativity," calculation of t'_1 and t'_2 in the Michelson-Morley experiment, suggest that the same remarks as in the Michelson-Morley experiment hold also for the experiments [38] and [39]. For example, the reflections of light in maser cavities or in Fabry-Perot cavity happen on the moving mirrors as in the Michelson-Morley experiment, which means that the optical paths between the reflecting ends have to be calculated taking into account the Doppler effect, i.e., as

in Driscoll's procedure [36]. In fact, the interference of the light waves, e.g., the light waves with close frequencies from two maser cavities in [38], is always determined by their phase difference and not only with their frequencies. Also it has to be noted that the theoretical predictions for the beat frequency variation are strongly dependent on the chosen synchronization. Hence, although the measurement of the beat frequency variation is more precise than the measurement of the shift in the number of fringes, it actually does not improve the testing of SR. Thus, contrary to the generally accepted opinion, the experiments [38] and [39] do not confirm the validity of the usual "AT relativity."

Regarding the "TT relativity," the modern laser versions [38] and [39] of the Michelson-Morley experiment are incomplete experiments (only the beat frequency variation is measured) and cannot be compared with the theory; in the "TT relativity" the same 4D quantity has to be considered in relatively moving IFRs and *the frequency, taken alone, is not a 4D quantity*.

6 THE KENNEDY-THORNDIKE TYPE EXPERIMENTS

In the Kennedy-Thorndike experiment [40] a Michelson interferometer with unequal armlengths was employed and they looked for possible diurnal and annual variations in the difference of the optical paths due to the motion of the interferometer with respect to the preferred frame. The measured quantity was, as in the Michelson-Morley experiment, the shift in the number of fringes, and in [40] the authors also found that was no observable fringe shift. We shall not discuss this experiment since the whole consideration is completely the same as in the case of the Michelson-Morley experiment, and, consequently, the same conclusion holds also here, i.e., the experiment [40] does not agree with the "AT relativity," but directly proves the "TT relativity." A modern version of the Kennedy-Thorndike experiment was carried out in [41], and the authors stated: "We have performed the physically equivalent measurement (with the Kennedy-Thorndike experiment, my remark) by searching for a sidereal 24-h variation in the frequency of a stabilized laser compared with the frequency of a laser locked to a stable cavity." The result was: "No variations were found at the level of 2×10^{-13} ." Also they declared: "This represents a 300-fold improvement over the original Kennedy-Thorndike experiment and *allows the Lorentz transformations to be deduced entirely from experiment at an accuracy level of 70 ppm.*" (my emphasis) The experiment [41] is of the same type as the experiment [39], and neither the experiment [39] is physically equivalent to the Michelson-Morley experiment, as shown above, nor, contrary to the opinion of the authors of [41], the experiment [41] is physically equivalent to the Kennedy-Thorndike experiment; the measurement of the beat frequency variation is not equivalent to the measurement of the change in the phase difference (in terms of the measurement of the shift in the number of fringes). Namely such equivalence can exist only in the usual "AT relativity" treatment since there the phase difference is determined only by the time difference. And, additionally, the Michelson-Morley and the Kennedy-Thorndike experiments can be compared both with the "AT relativity" and the "TT relativity", while the modern laser versions [39], [38] and [41] of these experiments are incomplete experiments from the "TT relativity" viewpoint and cannot be compared with the "TT relativity." Furthermore, the "TT relativity" deals with the covariant 4D Lorentz transformations L^a_b (1), or with their representations $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,e}$ (2) in the "e" coordinatization and with $L^{\mu'}_{\nu,r}$ (7) in the "r" coordinatization, and none of them can be deduced from the experiment [41]. Thus the treatment of the Michelson-Morley experiment with true tensor quantities from [2] and Sec. 5.1 here reveals that *the relevant quantity for the measurements both in the Michelson-Morley and the Kennedy-Thorndike type experiments is the phase (34) and in the experiments it has to be determined according to the relation (36)*.

7 THE IVES-STILLWEL TYPE EXPERIMENTS

Ives and Stilwell [42] performed a precision Doppler effect experiment in which they used a beam of excited hydrogen molecules as a moving light source. The frequencies of the light emitted parallel and antiparallel to the beam direction were measured by a spectrograph (at rest in the laboratory).

The measured quantity in this experiment is

$$\Delta f/f_0 = (\Delta f_b - \Delta f_r)/f_0, \quad (51)$$

where f_0 is the frequency of the light emitted from resting atoms. $\Delta f_b = |f_b - f_0|$ and $\Delta f_r = |f_r - f_0|$, where f_b is the blue-Doppler-shifted frequency that is emitted in a direction parallel to $\mathbf{v}$ ($\mathbf{v}$ is the velocity of the atoms relative to the laboratory), and f_r is the red-Doppler-shifted frequency that is emitted in a direction opposite to $\mathbf{v}$. The quantity $\Delta f/f_0$ measures the extent to which the frequency of the light from resting atoms fails to lie halfway between the frequencies f_r and f_b . In terms of wavelengths the relation (51) can be written as

$$\Delta \lambda/\lambda_0 = (\Delta \lambda_r - \Delta \lambda_b)/\lambda_0, \quad (52)$$

where $\Delta \lambda_r = |\lambda_r - \lambda_0|$ and $\Delta \lambda_b = |\lambda_b - \lambda_0|$, and, as we said, λ_r and λ_b are the wavelengths shifted due to the Doppler effect to the "red" and "blue" regions of the spectrum. In that way Ives and Stilwell replaced the difficult problem of the precise determination of the wavelength with much simpler problem of the determination of the asymmetry of shifts of the "red" and "blue" shifted lines with respect to the unshifted line. They [42] showed that the measured results agree with the formula predicted by the traditional formulation of SR, i.e., the usual "AT relativity," and not with the classical nonrelativistic expression for the Doppler effect. Let us explain it in more detail.

7.1 The "AT relativity" calculation

In the "AT relativity" one usually starts with the Lorentz transformation of the basis components $k^\mu(\omega/c, \mathbf{k} = \mathbf{n}\omega/c)$ of the 4-vector k^a of the light wave from an IFR S to the relatively moving (along the common x, x' -axes) IFR S' . Note that only the "e" coordinatization is used in such traditional treatment. Then the Lorentz transformation in the "e" coordinatization of k^μ can be written as

$$k^{0'} = \omega'/c = \gamma(\omega/c - \beta k^1), k^{1'} = \gamma(k^1 - \beta\omega/c), k^{2'} = k^2, k^{3'} = k^3, \quad (53)$$

or in terms of the unit wave vector $\mathbf{n}$ (which is in the direction of propagation of the wave)

$$\omega' = \gamma\omega(1 - \beta n^1), n^{1'} = N(n^1 - \beta), n^{2'} = (N/\gamma)n^2, n^{3'} = (N/\gamma)n^3, \quad (54)$$

where $N = (1 - \beta n^1)^{-1}$. Now comes the main point in the derivation. Although the Lorentz transformation of the basis components k^μ of the 4-vector k^a from S to S' , Eqs.(53) and (54), transforms all four components of k^μ the usual "AT relativity" treatment considers the transformation of the temporal part of k^μ , i.e., the frequency, as independent of the transformation of the spatial part of k^μ , i.e., the unit wave vector $\mathbf{n}$. Thus the "AT relativity" deals with two *independent* physical phenomena - the Doppler effect and the aberration of light. (Recall that we have already met such omission of one part of the Lorentz transformation of a 4-vector (written in the "e" coordinatization) in the derivation of the expressions for the Lorentz contraction (14) and the dilatation of time (17) in Sec. 2.2.) We note once again that such distinction is possible only in the "e" coordinatization; in the "r" coordinatization the metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu,r}$ is not diagonal and consequently the separation of the temporal and spatial parts does not exist. Thus the "AT relativity" calculation is restricted to the "e" coordinatization. In agreement with such theoretical treatment the existing experiments (including the modern experiments based on collinear laser spectroscopy; see, e.g., [43, 44, 45], or the review [46]) are designed in such a way to measure either the Doppler effect or the aberration of light. Let us write the above transformation in the form from which one can determine the quantities in (52) and then compare them with the experiments. The spectograph is at rest in the laboratory (the S frame) and the light source (at rest in the S' frame) is moving with $\mathbf{v}$ relative to S . Then in the usual "AT relativity" approach *only the first relation from (53), or (54), is used*, which means that, in the same way as shown in previous cases, *the "AT relativity" deals with two different quantities in 4D spacetime, here ω and ω'* . Then writting the transformation of the temporal part of k^μ , i.e., of ω , in terms of the wavelength λ we find

$$\lambda = \gamma\lambda_0(1 - \beta \cos \theta), \quad (55)$$

where λ is the wavelength received in the laboratory from the moving source (the shifted line), $\lambda_0 (= \lambda')$ is the natural wavelength (the unshifted line) and θ is the angle of $\mathbf{k}$ relative to the direction of $\mathbf{v}$ as measured in the laboratory. The nonrelativistic treatment of the Doppler effect predicts $\lambda = \lambda_0(1 - \beta \cos \theta)$, and in the classical case the Doppler shift does not exist for $\theta = \pi/2$. This transverse Doppler effect ($\theta = \pi/2$, $\lambda = \gamma\lambda_0$, or $\nu = \nu_0/\gamma$) is always, in the traditional, "AT relativity," approach considered to be a direct consequence of the time dilatation; it is asserted (e.g. [22]) that the frequencies must be related as the inverse of the times in the usual relation for the time dilatation $\Delta t = \Delta t_0\gamma$. It is usually interpreted [46]: "The Doppler shift experiments ... compare the rates of two "clocks" that are in motion relative to each other. *They measure time dilatation* (my emphasis) and can test the validity of the special relativity in this respect." Similarly it is declared in [43]: "The experiment represents a more than tenfold improvement over other Doppler shift measurements and *verifies the time dilation effect* (my emphasis) at an accuracy level of 2.3 ppm." Obviously, as we said, the Doppler shift experiments are theoretically analysed only by means of the "AT relativity," which treats the transformation of the temporal part of k^μ as independent of the transformation of the spatial part of k^μ , and moreover completely neglects the Lorentz transformation of the spatial part of k^μ .

In the Ives and Stilwell type experiments the measurements are conducted at symmetric observation angles θ and $\theta+180^\circ$; particularly in [42] θ is chosen to be $\simeq 0^\circ$. The wavelength in the direction of motion is obtained from (55) as $\lambda_b = \gamma\lambda_0(1 - \beta \cos \theta)$, while that one in the opposite direction (the angle $\theta + 180^\circ$) is $\lambda_r = \gamma\lambda_0(1 + \beta \cos \theta)$, and then $\Delta\lambda_b = |\lambda_b - \lambda_0| = |\lambda_0(1 - \gamma + \beta\gamma \cos \theta)|$, $\Delta\lambda_r = |\lambda_r - \lambda_0| = |\lambda_0(\gamma - 1 + \beta\gamma \cos \theta)|$, and the difference in shifts is

$$\Delta\lambda = \Delta\lambda_r - \Delta\lambda_b = 2\lambda_0(\gamma - 1) \simeq \lambda_0\beta^2, \quad (56)$$

where the last relation holds for $\beta \ll 1$. Note that the redshift due to the transverse Doppler effect ($\lambda_0\beta^2$) is independent on the observation angle θ . In the nonrelativistic case $\Delta\lambda = 0$, the transverse Doppler shift is zero. Ives and Stilwell found the agreement of the experimental results with the relation (56) and not with the classical result $\Delta\lambda = 0$.

However, a more careful analysis shows that the agreement between the "AT relativity" prediction Eq.(56) and the experiments [42] is, contrary to the general belief, only an "apparent" agreement and not the "true" one. This agreement actually happens for the following reasons. First, the theoretical result (56) is obtained in the "e" coordinatization in which one can speak about the frequency ω and the wave vector $\mathbf{k}$ as well-defined quantities. Using the matrix $T^\mu_{\nu,r}$ (5) which transforms the "e" coordinatization to the "r" coordinatization, $k_r^\mu = T^\mu_{\nu,r}k_e^\nu$ (only the components are considered), one finds $k_r^0 = k_e^0 - k_e^1 - k_e^2 - k_e^3$, $k_r^i = k_e^i$, whence we conclude that in the "r" coordinatization the theoretical predictions for *the components* of a 4-vector, i.e., for λ , will be quite different but in the "e" coordinatization, i.e., but the result (56), and thus not in the agreement with the experiment [42]. Further, *the specific choice of θ ($\theta \simeq 0^\circ$) in the experiments [42] is the next reason for the agreement with the "AT relativity" result (56)*. Namely, *if $\theta = 0^\circ$ then $n^1 = 1$, $n^2 = n^3 = 0$, and k^μ is $(\omega/c, \omega/c, 0, 0)$* . From (53) or (54) one finds that *in S' too $\theta' = 0^\circ$, $n^1 = 1$ and $n^2 = n^3 = 0$* (the same holds for $\theta = 180^\circ$, $n^1 = -1$, $n^2 = n^3 = 0$, then $\theta' = 180^\circ$ and $n^1 = -1$, $n^2 = n^3 = 0$). In the experiments [42] the emitter is the moving ion (its rest frame is S'), while the observer is the spectrometer at rest in the laboratory (the S frame). Since in [42] the angle of the ray emitted by the ion at rest is chosen to be $\theta' = 0^\circ$ (180°), then the angle of this ray measured in the laboratory, where the ion is moving, will be the same $\theta = 0^\circ$ (180°). (Similarly happens in the modern versions [43, 45] of the Ives-Stilwell experiment; the experiments [43, 45] make use of an atomic or ionic beam as a moving light analyzer (the accelerated ion is the "observer") and two collinear laser beams (parallel and antiparallel to the particle beam) as light sources (the emitter), which are at rest in the laboratory.) From this consideration we conclude that in these experiments one can consider only the Doppler effect, that is, the transformation of ω (the temporal part of k^μ ; the component form of the true 4-vector k^a in the "e" coordinatization), and not the aberration of light, i.e., the transformation of $\mathbf{n}$, i.e., $\mathbf{k}$, (the spatial part of k^μ). Because of that they found the agreement between the relation (55) (or (56)) with the experiments. However, the relations (53) and (54) reveal that in the case of an arbitrary θ the transformation of the temporal part of k^μ cannot be considered as independent of the transformation of the spatial part. This means that in such case one cannot expect that the

relation (56), taken alone, will be in agreement with the experiments performed at some arbitrary θ . Such experiments were, in fact, recently conducted and we discuss them here.

Pobedonostsev and collaborators [47] performed the Ives-Stilwell type experiment but improved the experimental setup and, what is particularly important, the measurements were conducted at symmetric observation angles 77° and 257° , which are different from 0° (and 180°). The measurement was done with a beam of H_2^+ ions at energies 175, 180, 210, 225, 260 and 275 keV. The radiation from hydrogen atoms in excited state, which are formed as a result of disintegration of accelerated H_2^+ , was observed. The radiation from the moving hydrogen atoms, giving the Doppler shifted lines, was observed together with the radiation from the resting atoms existing in the same working volume, and giving an unshifted line. The similar work was reported in [48] in which a beam of H_3^+ ions at energy 310 keV was used and the measurements were conducted at symmetric observation angles 82° and 262° . The results of the experiments [47] and [48] markedly differed from all previous experiments that were performed at observation angles $\theta = 0^\circ$ (and 180°). Therefore in [48] Pobedonostsev declared: *"In comparing the wavelength of Doppler shifted line from a moving emitter with the wavelength of an identical static emitter, the experimental data corroborate the classical formula for the Doppler effect, not the relativistic one."* Thus, instead of to find the "relativistic" result $\Delta\lambda \simeq \lambda_0\beta^2$ (56), (actually the "AT relativity" result), they found the classical result $\Delta\lambda \simeq 0$, i.e., they found that the redshift due to the transverse Doppler effect ($\lambda_0\beta^2$) is dependent on the observation angle θ . This experimental result strongly support our assertion that the agreement between the "AT relativity" and the Ives-Stilwell type experiments is only an "apparent" agreement and not the "true" one.

7.2 The "TT relativity" approach

As already said in the "TT relativity" neither the Doppler effect nor the aberration of light exist separately as well defined physical phenomena. As shown in [1, 2] and Sec. 2.2 here (see (17) and the discussion there) in the 4D spacetime the temporal distances (e.g., τ_E and τ_μ from Sec. 4.2) refer to different quantities, which are not connected by the Lorentz transformation. The same happens with ω and ω' as the temporal parts of k^μ , the component form of k^a in the "e" coordinatization. And, as Gamba [7] stated, the fact that the measurements of such quantities were made by *two* observers does not mean that relativity has something to do with the problem. In the "TT relativity" the entire 4D quantity, the true tensor or the CBGQ, has to be considered both in the theory and *in experiments*. Therefore, in order to theoretically discuss the experiments of the Ives-Stilwell type we choose as the relevant quantity the wave vector k^a , the geometric quantity, which can be written in the coordinate-based geometric language as the relation (35), $k^a = k^{\mu'} e_{\mu'} = k^\mu e_\mu = k_r^{\mu'} r_{\mu'} = k_r^\mu r_\mu$. Equivalently one can consider its square for which it holds that

$$k^a g_{ab} k^b = 0; \quad (57)$$

this expression is a Lorentz scalar and it is also independent of the choice of the coordinatization. The relations (35) and (57) show that we can calculate k^a (or $k^a g_{ab} k^b$) in the "e" coordinatization and in the rest frame of the emitter (the S' frame); the emitter is the ion moving in S , the rest frame of the spectrometer, i.e., in the laboratory frame. In other permissible coordinatizations and in other relatively moving IFRs these quantities will be exactly the same as in S' and the "e" coordinatization. That is a great practical advantage of the true tensor formulation of SR; *when the whole (including the basis) 4D tensor quantity is considered then it is an invariant quantity.*

First we consider the experiments [47] and [48] since they showed the disagreement with the traditional theory, i.e., with the "AT relativity." Then k^a in the "e" coordinatization and in S' is represented by the CBGQ $k^{\mu'} e_{\mu'}$ whence the components $k^{\mu'}$ are $k^{\mu'} = (\omega'/c)(1, \cos\theta', \sin\theta', 0)$ and $k^{\mu'} k_{\mu'} = 0$. The observer (the spectrometer) in the laboratory frame will look at *the same 4D quantity* k^a , or equivalently the CBGQ $k^\mu e_\mu$, and find k^μ , the Lorentz transformed component form in the "e" coordinatization of the wave vector $k^\mu e_\mu$, as

$$k^\mu = [\gamma(\omega'/c)(1 + \beta \cos\theta'), \gamma(\omega'/c)(\cos\theta' + \beta), (\omega'/c) \sin\theta', 0],$$

whence $k^\mu k_\mu$ is also = 0. From that transformation one can find that

$$n^1 = (n^{1'} + \beta)/(1 + \beta n^{1'}), n^2 = n^{2'}/\gamma(1 + \beta n^{1'}), n^3 = n^{3'}/\gamma(1 + \beta n^{1'}),$$

or that

$$\begin{aligned}\sin \theta &= \sin \theta' / \gamma (1 + \beta \cos \theta'), \cos \theta = (\cos \theta' + \beta) / (1 + \beta \cos \theta'), \\ \tan \theta &= \sin \theta' / \gamma (\beta + \cos \theta').\end{aligned}\tag{58}$$

The relations (58) reveal that not only ω is changed (the Doppler effect) when going from S' to S but also the angle of $\mathbf{k}$ relative to the direction of $\mathbf{v}$ is changed (the aberration of light). This means that if the observation of the unshifted line (i.e., of the frequency $\omega' = \omega_0$ from the atom at rest) is performed at an observation angle θ' in S' , the rest frame of the emitter, then *the same light wave* (from the same but now moving atom) will have the shifted frequency ω and *will be seen* at an observation angle θ (generally, $\neq \theta'$) in S , the rest frame of the spectrometer. In S' the quantities ω' and θ' define the CBGQ $k^{\mu'} e_{\mu'}$, and this propagation 4-vector satisfies the relation $k^{\mu'} k_{\mu'} = 0$, which is the representation of the relation (57) in the "e" coordinatization and in the S' frame. The quantities ω' and θ' (that define the corresponding $k^{\mu'} e_{\mu'}$ in S') are connected with the corresponding ω and θ (that define the corresponding $k^{\mu} e_{\mu}$ in S) by means of the Lorentz transformation $L^{\mu'}_{\nu, e}$ (2) (and its inverse) of $k^{\mu'} e_{\mu'}$. Then $k^{\mu} e_{\mu}$ is such that it also satisfies the relation $k^{\mu} k_{\mu} = 0$, the representation of (57) in the "e" coordinatization and now in the S frame. The authors of the experiments [47] (and [48]) *made the observation of the radiation from the atom at rest (the unshifted line) and from a moving atom at the same observation angle*. The preceding discussion shows that if they succeeded to see $\omega' = \omega_0$ (i.e., λ_0) from the atom at rest at some symmetric observation angles $\theta' (\neq 0)$ and $\theta' + 180^\circ$ (i.e., some $k^{\mu'} e_{\mu'}$) then they could not see the assymetric Doppler shift (from moving atoms) at the same angles $\theta = \theta'$ (and $\theta + 180^\circ = \theta' + 180^\circ$). The Lorentz transformation does not connect such quantities. This was the reason that they detected $\Delta\lambda \simeq 0$ and not $\Delta\lambda \simeq \lambda_0 \beta^2$. But we expect that the result $\Delta\lambda \simeq \lambda_0 \beta^2$ can be seen *if the similar measurements of the frequencies, i.e., the wavelengths, of the radiation from moving atoms would be performed not at $\theta = \theta'$ but at θ determined by the relation (58). Only in that case one will make measurement of the same quantity $k^a = k^{\mu'} e_{\mu'} = k^{\mu} e_{\mu}$ from two different relatively moving IFRs.*

Recently, Bekljamishev [49] came to the same conclusions (but dealing only with the component form in the "e" coordinatization) and explained the results of the experiments [47] and [48] taking into account the aberration of light together with the Doppler effect. It is argued in [49] that Eq.(55) for the Doppler effect can be realized only when the condition for the aberration angle is fulfilled,

$$\Delta\theta = \beta \sin \theta',\tag{59}$$

where $\Delta\theta = \theta' - \theta$, and β is taken to be $\beta \ll 1$. The relation (59) directly follows from the expression for $\sin \theta$ in (58) taking that $\beta \ll 1$. *The assymetric shift will be seen when the collimator assembly is tilted at a velocity dependent angle $\Delta\theta$.* Instead of to work, as usual, with the arms of the collimator at fixed angles θ and $\theta + 180^\circ$, Bekljamishev [49] proposed that the collimator assembly must be constructed in such a way that there is the possibility of the correction of the observation angles independently for both arms; for example, the arm at angle θ ($\theta + 180^\circ$) has to be tilted clockwise (counter-clockwise) by the aberration angle $\Delta\theta$. Otherwise the assymetry in the Doppler shifts will not be observed. Thus the experiments [47] and [48] would need to be repeated taking into account Bekljamishev's proposition. *The positive result for the Doppler shift $\Delta\lambda$ (56), when the condition for the aberration angle $\Delta\theta$ (59) is fulfilled, will definitely show that it is not possible to treat the Doppler effect and the aberration of light as separate, well-defined, effects, i.e., that it is the "TT relativity," and not the "AT relativity," which correctly explains the experiments that test SR.*

8 CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

In the first part of this paper we have discussed and exposed the main differences between three theoretical formulations of SR, the "TT relativity," the covariant approach to SR and the "AT relativity." In the second part we have presented the comparison of these formulations with the experiments. The analysis of the experiments which test SR shows that they agree with the predictions of the "TT relativity" and not, as usually supposed, with those of the "AT relativity."

In the "muon" experiment the fluxes of muons on a mountain, N_m , and at sea level, N_s , are measured. The "AT relativity" predicts different values of the flux N_s (for the same measured N_m) in different synchronizations, but the measured N_s is of course independent of the chosen coordinatization. Further, for some synchronizations these predicted values of the flux at sea level N_s are quite different than the measured ones. The reason for such disagreement, as explained in the theoretical part of this paper, Secs. 2, 2.1 and 2.2, is that in the usual, "AT relativity," analysis of the "muon" experiment, for example, the lifetimes τ_E and τ_μ are considered to refer to the same temporal distance (the same quantity) measured by the observers in two relatively moving IFRs. But the transformation connecting τ_E and τ_μ (the dilatation of time (17)) is only *a part* of the Lorentz transformation written in the "e" coordinatization, and, actually, τ_E and τ_μ refer to different quantities in 4D spacetime. Although their measurements were made by *two* observers, the relativity has nothing to do with the problem, since τ_E and τ_μ are different 4D quantities. *The "TT relativity," in contrast to the "AT relativity," completely agrees with the "muon" experiments in all IFRs and all permissible coordinatizations.* In the "TT relativity" *the same 4D quantity* (a true tensor or a CBGQ) is considered in different IFRs and different coordinatizations; instead of to work with τ_E and τ_μ the "TT relativity" deals with the spacetime length l and the distance 4-vector l_{AB}^α and formulate the radioactive-decay law in terms of invariant quantities, i.e., the true tensors or the CBGQs, Eqs. (30), (31) and (32).

In the Michelson-Morley experiment the traditional, "AT relativity," derivation of the fringe shift ΔN deals only with the calculation, in the "e" coordinatization, of t_1 and t_2 (in S and S'), which are the times required for the complete trips OM_1O and OM_2O along the arms of the Michelson-Morley interferometer. The null fringe shift obtained with such calculation is only in an "apparent," not "true," agreement with the observed null fringe shift, since this agreement was obtained by an incorrect procedure. Namely it is supposed in such derivation that, e.g., t_1 and t'_1 refer to the same quantity measured by the observers in relatively moving IFRs S and S' that are connected by the Lorentz transformation. However the relation $t'_1 = \gamma t_1$, as shown in Secs. 2, 2.1 and 2.2, is not the Lorentz transformation of some 4D quantity, and t'_1 and t_1 do not correspond to the same 4D quantity considered in S' and S respectively. Our "TT relativity," in contrast to the "AT relativity" calculations, deals always with the true tensor quantities or the CBGQs; in the Michelson-Morley experiment it is the phase (34) $\phi = k^a g_{ab} l^b$ defined as the true tensor quantity, or equivalently the phase (36) defined as the CBGQ. *The "TT relativity" calculations yields the observed null fringe shift (40) and that result holds for all IFRs and all coordinatizations.* In addition we have shown that the usual "AT relativity" actually deals only with the part $k^0 l_0$ of the whole phase ϕ , (34) or (36). This contribution $k^0 l_0$ is considered in the interferometer rest frame S , while in the S' frame, in which the interferometer is moving, the usual "AT relativity" takes into account only the contribution $k^0 l_{0'}$; the k^0 factor is taken to be the same in S and S' frames (all is done only in the "e" coordinatization). Thus in the usual "AT relativity" two different quantities $k_e^0 l_{0e}$ and $k_e^0 l_{0'e}$ (only the parts of the phase (34) or (36)) are considered to be the same 4D quantity for observers in S and S' frames, and these quantities are considered to be connected by the Lorentz transformation. Such an incorrect procedure then caused an apparent (not true) agreement of the traditional analysis with the results of the Michelson-Morley experiment. Since only a part of the whole phase ϕ (34) or (36) is considered the traditional result is synchronization, i.e., coordinatization, dependent results. The agreement between the traditional analysis and the experiment exists only when Einstein's synchronization of distant clocks is used and not for another synchronization. This is also proved in Sec. 4.1, where the non-null fringe shift (50) is found for the "r" coordinatization. The improved "AT relativity" calculation of the fringe shift from [36] (again in the "e" coordinatization) takes into account the changes in frequencies due to the Doppler effect and finds a "surprising" non-null fringe shift (41). We have shown in Sec. 4.1 that the non-null theoretical result for the fringe shift (41) from [36] is easily obtained from our "TT relativity" approach taking only the product $k_e^{0'} l_{0'e}$ in the calculation of the increment of phase ϕ'_e in S' in which the apparatus is moving. Thus again as in the usual "AT relativity" calculation two different quantities $k_e^0 l_{0e}$ and $k_e^{0'} l_{0'e}$ (only the parts of the phase (34) or (36)) are considered to be the same 4D quantity for observers in S and S' frames, and consequently that these two quantities are connected by the Lorentz transformation. Since only a part $k_e^{0'} l_{0'e}$ of the whole 4D tensor quantity ϕ (34) or (36) is considered the non-null fringe shift (41) can be shown to be quite different in another coordinatization, e.g., in the "r" coordinatization (see [2]).

The same conclusions can be drawn for the Kennedy-Thorndike type experiments.

In the Ives-Stilwell type experiments the agreement between the "AT relativity" calculation for the Doppler effect and the experiments is again only an "apparent" agreement and not the "true" one. Namely the transverse Doppler shift ($\lambda_0\beta^2$, (56)) is obtained in the "e" coordinatization in which one can speak about the frequency ω and the wave vector $\mathbf{k}$ as well-defined quantities. Further in the usual "AT relativity" approach only the transformation of ω (the temporal part of k^μ) is considered, while the aberration of light, i.e., the transformation of $\mathbf{n}$, i.e., $\mathbf{k}$, (the spatial part of k^μ) is neglected. (k^μ is the component form in the "e" coordinatization of the true tensor k^a (35).) Thus in this case too the "AT relativity" deals with two different quantities in 4D spacetime, ω and ω' , which are not connected by the Lorentz transformation. However, for the specific choice of the observation angles $\theta' = 0^0$ (180^0) in S' (the rest frame of the emitter), one finds from the transformation of k^μ that θ in S is again $= 0^0$ (180^0). Since in the experiments [42], and its modern versions [43, 45], just such angles were chosen, it was possible to consider only the transformation of ω , i.e., only the Doppler effect, and not the concomitant aberration of light. Because of that they found the agreement between the relation (55) (or (56)) and the experiments. When the experiments were performed at observation angles $\theta \neq 0^0$ (and 180^0), as in [47] and [48], the results disagreed with the "AT relativity" calculation which takes into account only the transformation of ω , i.e., only the Doppler effect. Furthermore, since the "AT relativity" calculation deals only with a part of the whole 4D quantity k^a (35), the agreement with the experiments will not exist in, e.g., the "r" coordinatization. The "TT relativity" calculation considers the whole 4D quantity, the wave vector k^a (35) (or its square (57)). Therefore one can make the whole calculation in the "e" coordinatization and in S' , the rest frame of the emitter. All results are frame and coordinatization independent. Now the Doppler effect and the aberration of light are unseparated phenomena. The results of such calculation agrees with the experiments [42] and [43, 45] (made at $\theta = 0^0$ (180^0)). Also the "TT relativity" calculation predicts the positive result for the Doppler shift $\Delta\lambda$ (56) in the experiments of the type [47] and [48], if the condition for the aberration angle $\Delta\theta$ (59) is fulfilled. This agrees with Bekljamishev's explanation [49] (that is valid only in the "e" coordinatization) of the experiments [47] and [48]. The advantage of the "TT relativity" calculation is that it is valid in all permissible coordinatizations.

The discussion in this paper clearly shows that *our invariant formulation of SR, i.e., the "TT relativity," completely agrees with all considered experiments in all IFRs and all permissible coordinatizations*. This is not the case with none of the "AT relativity" formulations of SR. These results are directly contrary to the generally accepted opinion about the validity of the usual "AT relativity," i.e., of the Einstein formulation of SR.

References

- [1] T. Ivezić, E-print archives physics/0012048; to be published in Found. Phys.
- [2] T. Ivezić, E-print archives physics/010191; to be published in Phys. Essays.
- [3] A. Einstein, Ann. Physik 17 (1905) 891, tr. by W. Perrett and G.B. Jeffery, in The principle of relativity, Dover, New York.
- [4] T.Ivezić, Found. Phys. Lett. 12 (1999) 105.
- [5] T.Ivezić, Found. Phys. Lett. 12 (1999) 507.
- [6] F. Rohrlich, Nuovo Cimento B 45 (1966) 76.
- [7] A. Gamba, Am. J. Phys. 35 (1967) 83.
- [8] R.M. Wald, General relativity, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984.
- [9] B.F. Schutz, A first course in general relativity, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.
- [10] C.W. Misner, K.S. Thorne and J.A. Wheeler, Gravitation, Freeman, San Francisco, 1970.
- [11] C. Leubner, K. Aufinger and P. Krumm, Eur. J. Phys. 13 (1992) 170.

- [12] R. Anderson, I Vetharaniam, G.E. Stedman, Phys. Rep. 295 (1998) 93.
- [13] D.E. Fahnline, Am. J. Phys. 50 (1982) 818.
- [14] K. Geiger, Phys. Rep. 258 (1995) 240.
- [15] V. Borchers, J. Meyer, S. Gieseke, G. Martens and C.C. Noack, Phys. Rev. C 62 (2000) 064903.
- [16] T. Ivezić, E-print archives physics/0007031.
- [17] G. Cavalleri and G. Spinelli, Nuovo Cimento B 66 (1970) 11.
- [18] Ø. Grøn, Am. J. Phys. 49 (1981) 28.
- [19] V. N. Strel'tsov, Found. Phys. 6 (1976) 293; Physics of Particles and Atomic Nuclei 22 (1991) 1129 (in Russian); Hadronic Journal 17 (1994) 105.
- [20] R. Golestanian, M.R.H. Khajepour and R. Mansouri, Class. Quantum Grav. 12 (1995) 273.
- [21] R.P. Feynman, R.B. Leighton and M. Sands, The Feynman lectures on physics, Vol.1 Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1964 (Sec.15).
- [22] C. Kittel, W.D. Knight and M.A. Ruderman, Mechanics, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965.
- [23] D.H. Frisch and J.H. Smith, Am. J. Phys. 31 (1963) 342.
- [24] N. Easwar and D.A. MacIntire, Am. J. Phys. 59 (1991) 589.
- [25] B. Rossi and D.B. Hall, Phys. Rev. 59 (1941) 223.
- [26] D.S. Ayres et al., Phys. Rev. D 3 (1971) 1051.
- [27] J. Bailey et al., Nature 268 (1977) 301; J. Bailey et al., Nucl. Phys. B 150 (1979) 1.
- [28] D. Newman, G.W. Ford, A. Rich, and E. Sweetman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40 (1978) 1355; F. Combley, F.J.M. Farley, J.H. Field, and E. Picasso, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 (1979) 1383; R.D. Sard, Phys. Rev. D. 21 (1980) 549.
- [29] Young-Sea Huang, Helv. Phys.Acta 66 (1993) 346; Phys. Essays 9 (1996) 21; Phys. Essays 9 (1996) 340.
- [30] J.H. Field, Helv. Phys.Acta 66 (1993) 875.
- [31] R.A. Nelson, J. Math. Phys. 28 (1987) 2379; J. Math. Phys. 35 (1994) 6224.
- [32] D.A.T. Vanzella and G.E.A. Matsas, H.W. Crater, Am. J. Phys. 64 (1996) 1075.
- [33] T. Ivezić, Preprint SCAN 9802018-CERN.
- [34] A.A. Michelson, E.H. Morley, Am. J. Sci. 34 (1887) 333.
- [35] M.P. Haugan and C.M. Will, Phys. Today 40 (1987) 69.
- [36] R.B. Driscoll, Phys. Essays 10 (1997) 394.
- [37] R.A. Schumacher, Am.J. Phys. 62 (1994) 609.
- [38] T.S. Jaseja, A. Javan, J. Murray, and C.H. Townes, Phys. Rev. A 133 (1964) 1221.
- [39] A. Brillet and J.L. Hall, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 (1979) 549.
- [40] R.J. Kennedy and E.M. Thorndike, Phys. Rev. B. 42 (1932) 400.
- [41] D. Hils and J.L. Hall, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 (1990) 1697.
- [42] H.E. Ives and G.R. Stilwell, J. Opt. Soc. Am. 28 (1938) 215; 31 (1941) 369.

- [43] R.W. McGowan, D.M. Giltner, S.J. Sternberg S.A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993) 251.
- [44] E. Riis, U.A. Andersen, N. Bjerre, O.Poulsen, S.A. Lee, and J.L. Hall, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (1988) 81.
- [45] R. Klein et al., Z. Phys. A 342 (1992) 455.
- [46] M. Kretzschmar, Z. Phys. A - Hadrons and Nuclei 342 (1992) 463).
- [47] L.A. Pobedonostsev, Y.M. Kramarovsky, P.F. Parshin, B.K. Seleznev and A.B. Berezin, Journal of Technical Physics 3 (1989) 84 (in Russian).
- [48] L.A. Pobedonostsev, Galilean Electrodynamics 6 (1995) 117.
- [49] V.O. Bekljamishev, Journal of Technical Physics 69 (1999) 124 (in Russian).